BERKELEY BAPTIST DIVINITY SCHOOL LIBRARY

July, 1935 Vol. XII. No. 3

THE CROZER QUARTERLY

CONTENTS

PAGE

WANTED: A COMMONWEALTH BASED ON THE RECOGNITION OF THE SUPREMACY OF PERSONALITY. Frederick B. Igler 225

YOGA. Prof. George W. Briggs 236

GETHSEMANE. Martin Dibelius 254

SHELLEY AND CHRISTIANITY. Frederick L. Jones 266

A BAPTIST STATE. R. E. E. Harkness 274

RELIGION AND NATIONALISM. Orville A. Petty, Ph. D. 290

BOOK REVIEWS 296

BOOK NOTICES 317

BOOKS RECEIVED 319

THE CROZER QUARTERLY

THE CROZER QUARTERLY is published by the Faculty of Crozer Theological Seminary, with the aid of funds provided by the Trustees. THE QUARTERLY aims to be a journal for the expression of theological opinion, embracing all the interests of students of religion, whether ministers, teachers, or laymen. It does not accept responsibility for the views expressed, publication indicating that the editors regard the articles as voicing opinions important enough to command attention.

A. STEWART WOODBURNE, Editor.
RITTENHOUSE NEISSER, Business Manager.

Editorial communications, contributions and books for review should be sent to

THE EDITOR, THE CROZER QUARTERLY
Crozer Theological Seminary, Chester, Pa.

Remittances and business communications should be addressed to

THE BUSINESS MANAGER, THE CROZER QUARTERLY
Crozer Theological Seminary, Chester, Pa.

Requests for catalogues and communications regarding courses in the Seminary should be addressed to

PRESIDENT JAMES H. FRANKLIN
Crozer Theological Seminary, Chester, Pa.

Subscription, $1.50 the year; single numbers, 40 cents

Printed for the Crozer Theological Seminary by
THE JUDSON PRESS
Philadelphia, Pa.

Entered as second-class matter, December 21, 1923, at the post-office at Chester, Pa., under Act of March 3, 1879.

Acceptance for mailing at special rate of postage provided for in Section 1103, Act of October 3, 1917, authorized December 21, 1923.

Copyright, July, 1935, by Crozer Theological Seminary.

THE CROZER QUARTERLY

Vol. XII JULY, 1935 No. 3

WANTED: A COMMONWEALTH BASED ON THE RECOGNITION OF THE SUPREMACY OF PERSONALITY

FREDERICK B. IGLER

Baptist Minister to Students, Christian Association, University of Pennsylvania

THIS is the day of remaking commonwealths. Personality has a large stake in the process. In considering this theme we are dealing with Utopian thinking. It is a dream of the new heaven and the new earth wherein dwelleth righteousness. It is a recognition of the inadequacy of the present commonwealth with reference to personality.

This theme demands a sweeping analysis of the present state of the commonwealth rather than a particular analysis, for personality we are coming to recognize is the resultant of the summation of the total social forces playing on life. I want to sketch the areas of our modern life which make impossible at present a commonwealth based on the recognition of the supremacy of personality, and to suggest either directly or indirectly what those who are striving to be specialists in religion can do to secure a commonwealth where abundant life will be the goal of living.

I

Our American system of education touching life as it does in the formative years is under indictment from the point of view of our approach. When we have said the many splendid things which can be said about the little red schoolhouse, about our ideal of free education for all, about our great system of higher education, the indictment still stands—our educational system does not help us to secure a commonwealth based on the recognition of the supremacy of personality.

We have stressed preparation for making a living rather than how to live. Do not misunderstand me at this point; for the necessity of earning food, clothing and shelter is very real in these days. The goal held before our students in the main has been "a chicken in every pot and two automobiles in every garage." We have gotten the ends and

the means of life all mixed up. Rabbi Abba Hillel Silver in speaking to the New Jersey State Teachers Association at a recent meeting in Atlantic City is reported to have said, " Educators must train children less in terms of a personal career and business success, and more in terms of a joyous coworker in the common social task. The model must no longer be the poor boy who gets rich by work and thrift, but the poor boy who by dint of cultivation of his character and the exercise of his talents becomes a valuable member of the community."

Then too, the method of our education has been largely that of memory and rote, rather than of the development of creative ability. Regimentation and standardization of output have been our great sins. The social consequences of life have not been part of the process. The assimiliation of facts without regard to the type of character in control of the facts is a dominant trend in our larger universities. On the other hand, too many of our smaller colleges, most of them denominational schools, have placed a premium on so-called character-emphasis at the expense of true scholarship.

Schools, and in this word I include teachers, content of courses (it might be interesting to read a recent report made by the Federal Trade Commission on the way in which public utilities have played havoc with our schools in terms of their propaganda), and make-up of the curriculum have been made the football of politicians, patriotic zealots and vested interests. Teachers in great sweeps of our country are being paid less than unskilled labor. Children in too many communities have been gazing at closed schools.

Ideas are on the march. The world is aflame with discovery. Any commonwealth having as its objective the supremacy of personality must give serious thought to the goals of education and the processes by which we may reach those goals in terms of persons at their highest level. Any other procedure means courting a social organization which in the end will wreck itself.

II

Our general press, and in that phrase I include the general field of literature, is not helping us to build such a commonwealth. With the exception of a very few outstanding papers, if one were to take the average daily and cut out the news having to do with crimes against the person and property, there would be left little else but pages of advertisement. Among that which would be left we would find concentrated stories of mystery and adventure reeking with maudlin sentiment, or articles which appeal to the development of abnormality in the individual.

These sheets are the breakfast schoolmasters and the evening lullabys of great masses of our population. Exaggerated emphasis, distorted truth, and racial, class and political prejudice give our people a sense of the cheapness of life. Even one of our denominational papers in a recent issue carried the following note: "A writer in the *Moody Bible Institute Monthly* says that a group of Jewish financiers hold a mortgage on civilization. They hold the purse-strings of the world's finances, control the press, the magazines, and the moving-pictures, and have a strangle-hold on America's finances through the liquor business, ninety per cent. of the wholesalers being Jews." Then this religious weekly adds its own editorial comment in these words: "If all this is so, then many countries of the world need Hitlers even though their methods of dealing with the problem would be a little different from those of the Hitler of Germany." That is damnable propaganda and cheapens life.

One might in this regard with justification question the ethics of the whole field of advertising. Consumers Research in its publications makes one ashamed of our general stupidity in the ease with which advertisers lull us to sleep, and while asleep sell us the by-products of dishonesty. Such a condition should make us fighting mad, for it, too, is a recognition of the cheapness of human life.

A leisurely jaunt through the bookshops catering to the buyers of cheap books, or a detailed perusal of lending libraries makes one interested in the supremacy of personality at its best question the outcome.

Freedom of speech, including the liberty of press, we must maintain; but who can tell us where the limits of such liberty are to be found? The great dailies and the book-publishing concerns are controlled by a very small circle, but their influence in determining the cheapness or the worth of personality is wide-spread and profound.

Heywood Broun, the columnist, recently wrote: "America, like every other nation, was talked and drummed and written into the last war. The pen was not only mightier than the sword, but twice as pernicious. Writers of the world unite . . . you have nothing to loose but the chains which bind you to conniving propagandists. If the molders of public opinion can bring about a war through concerted effort, there is reason to believe that they might also prevent one . . . great whooping lies were circulated in the United States before we joined in the Great War . . . writers should be as stalwart as doctors. . ." A commonwealth which has a mind to recognize the supremacy of personality must prepare to battle these forces which over a wide-spread area do not hesitate to subordinate personality to prejudice, smut, exaggeration and misrepresentation of the truth.

III

The preamble of the Constitution holds those words so oft repeated, "Life, liberty and pursuit of happiness." Ideally the democratic form of government is committed to the supremacy of personality. Practically it is working out less and less that way. To get a bird's-eye view of the political situation, one need only mention such words and phrases as buying of votes, trading on illiteracy, stolen elections, the boss-controlled machines of city and state, the emphasis on personalities rather than on principles, the development of sectional bargaining, the bewilderment of the average voter at election with the length of the ballot, the small proportion of our citizens who vote, the Democratic South and the Republican North, the charges and the counter-charges during electioneering. A study of Huey Long and his methods in Louisiana, of Bilbo in Mississippi, of Tammany in New York City, of the recent Republican machine in Pennsylvania, will substantiate the studies recounted in Lincoln Steffen's autobiography and in many other writings. Political misrule has considered life very cheap.

The extension of our territory and the growth of our population has made the old town meeting a matter of memory. The seat of government now seems a long way removed from the average man, and in a sense is out of his control. It hovers over him like a great machine. It has become his master rather than his servant. We face the necessity of finding a technique by which we can bridge the chasm, if the political state is to enhance personality.

IV

A body of laws seems to be a necessity for the proper adjustment of life. We multiply our laws, however, more rapidly than we can find the technique to enforce them. Confusion results. Moreover, too many of our laws become sacrosanct. They become the dead hand of the past controlling the present and dominating the future. By and large the letter of the law and not the spirit of the law holds control. Witness the controversy over the present status of the Constitution of the United States, or any attempt to bring up-to-date the Constitution of the State of Pennsylvania.

Too frequently the interpreters of the law are not aware of social trends, and the breaker of the law stands before the court to be judged in the spirit of vengeance, rather than in the light of social and personal redemption. Too many of the laws enacted are for the protection of the property of the few and not the rights of the many. Lawyers for big fees

find the loopholes in legislation that the powerful corporations or individuals may benefit therefrom. Is it any wonder that our courts have gained the reputation of being the refuge of the strong and the oppressors of the weak? One is tempted at this point to mention the Scottsboro boys, Tom Mooney, unprevented lynchings, judges who snarl out sentences like the "big bad wolf," million-dollar embezzlers who are acquitted while hundred-dollar criminals take the rap, and so on *ad infinitum.*

Dean Roscoe Pound of the Harvard University Law School, former presidents of the American Bar Association, and a few scattered lawyers have pressed these points home on many occasions in recent years. Just recently the Board of Censors of the Philadelphia Bar Association has brought most serious charges against a group of lawyers of Philadelphia. If these charges are sustained, they will show a connivance and conspiracy between members of the profession (some of whom sit in the state legislature and make our laws, while others occupy positions passing on the qualifications of city employees) and leaders of modern racketeering gangs. Lawyers will tell you these conditions are not peculiar to Philadelphia. Now a commonwealth built on the recognition of the supremacy of personality must have in its law-making, legal-advising and judicial personnel, men who value personality at its highest.

V

Smoldering resentment on the part of parents and others interested in the present and future citizenship of our country lead finally to the Catholic Legion of Decency and kindred movements in other groups against the motion-picture industry. No sane person questions the statement that many of the motion-pictures being seen by millions cheapen life from every angle of approach. One does not have to be a Puritan or belong to a society guarding the morals of our country to make the same just criticism of much that is produced on our stage. Actors and playwrights such as Channing Pollock and Bert Lytell tell it much more convincingly. How to preserve freedom of expression and not to be afraid of the stark facts of life, and yet to have limits beyond which those interested in developing personality at its best cannot go (and this should include all agencies affecting individual and group life), is a difficult question, but one which must not be shirked.

VI

An understanding of the economic structure of our common life is fundamental in considering those forces which in our present commonwealth make life cheap. A society recognizing the supremacy of per-

sonality must deal realistically with the following charges against our present economic order. We destroy goods, turn crops under, refuse to plant fertile soil, and keep machinery-wheels standing idle while half-naked, hungry and unemployed men with dependent families walk our streets or sit in the shambles called homes. We hear pleas for individualism of the rugged sort whose undercurrent slogan is " to get all you can while the getting is good, regardless of how you get it." We claim that government must not enter into our particular business though the way we run it gives no social justification for its continued being. Our government decides through its experts on what is a minimum yearly wage to provide decency for a family or an individual; but the same government bowls us over continuously with statistics which remind us that most of our fellows are living of necessity below that line of decency.

This is a good place to remind ourselves that somewhere in the neighborhood of four per cent. of our people own about eighty-six per cent. of our wealth, and thus control the limits of expansive personality. Economic insecurity strangles the great majority of our people, and yet we find powerful opposition to social insurance covering old age, unemployment and sickness. We witness business firms taking profit out of the slaughter of wars and the stimulation of future conflicts. We erect our tariffs and boast of our own economic national self-sufficiency though our selfish short-sighted policy brings ruin in its wake. We permit our great natural resources to rest in the control of private companies for the benefit of the few at the expense of the many. We have found ways to produce an abundance. We must find ways to distribute the abundance to the needs of people.

A commonwealth built around an economic system about which these charges are made in truth, and much more might be said in truth, is not a commonwealth which recognizes the supremacy of personality. That cannot be!

Have I painted the picture too black? I do not think so. Have I appeared cynical and pessimistic of the possibilities of life? That is not my spirit, for I affirm life in the daily struggle which perplexes me so terrifically, and out of the struggle receive the buoyancy to continue the fight. We have committed ourselves to the concept of the kingdom of God. We believe in the sacredness of personality. We believe that this is God's world and that we are stewards who hold it in trust. What can we do to make our commonwealth one that increasingly recognizes the supremacy of personality? I would suggest several approaches which for lack of space must be treated all too briefly.

1. We must teach, preach and live the truth of that seemingly new and startling fact, the interdependence of all life. Rickenbacker flies from our west coast to the east coast in twelve hours; Stefansson, the explorer, states recently that in his judgment the next ten years will see the Arctic region a network of air-liners in a short cut to Europe; the distance between England and Australia is spanned in an amazingly short space of time—well, this is our world. Over-the-back-yard-fence gossip is carried on in an international scale, and neighborhood quarrels develop into world cataclysms.

Our growing proximity to each other is rich with great possibilities for personality. It may on the other hand be a strangling force. Any narrow theory of nationalism closes its eyes to reality. Mazzini sometime ago said: "The epoch of individuality is concluded, and it is the duty of reformers to initiate the epoch of association. Collective man is omnipotent upon the earth he treads." Religious forces interested in the supremacy of personality must in these days do battle with a significant opposition in the persons of Father Charles Coughlin, William Randolph Hearst and others who deny this interdependence of life.

2. We must now teach and preach what to many is a new doctrine—that environment largely makes or breaks people. We now know but are loath to admit that social forces which surround us damn personality faster than high and sane religion can save it. L. P. Jacks on his recent trip to America was being shown the slum section of New York City. When the guide remarked as to the number of children born in this section each year, the famous churchman replied, "Not born, but damned into life."

We must strive to create a social order in which it will be just as easy for a person to choose good as it is to choose evil. Anything less is a terrible handicap to the growth of personality. We are dealing with mighty forces in high places, ecclesiastical and political, and mere surface or sentimental treatment will avail little. The religious community must awaken to the fact that destructive elements in our environmental life include more than the handling of intoxicating liquors. The burden is placed upon us of finding a technique by which we can battle these social forces with some hope of a fair fight, and victory at least in the balance.

3. We must teach, preach and live the truth of the terrible reality of sin. Intelligent people lose the sting of its meaning in a maze of relativity, while less intelligent ones still think of sin largely in terms of cards, the dance, the theatre and gambling. The limits of sin must be pushed out to include our interdependent life. Sin in the abstract means nothing to our age. Is war sin? Is selling munitions in the hope of stimulating a war sin? Is paying a wage less than adequate to maintain

decent living a sin? Is lynching, to both participants and onlookers, a sin? Is failure to oppose child labor a sin? Our age needs to know of sin in the concrete and specific. We need, too, to cultivate the social sensitivity of Maurice of England, or of Eugene Debs of our own country who felt a sense of guilt for those whom society had declared antisocial bodies. A knowledge of the terrible reality of sin even in this modern sense will help us little until we see ourselves as part of the total process. Muriel Lester of Kingsley House, London, said recently when asked a question about Hitler and the Nazis, " We ought not to blame Hitler and the Nazis so much, even though they need plenty, as we ought to blame ourselves for making Hitler and the Nazi government possible." Remember we are thinking of a state in which personality will be recognized as supreme.

4. We need to teach and preach that salvation is a social process. Bible verses do not save a man. Belief alone avails him nothing. Man does not walk into heaven through a revolving door which someone else has pushed. Salvation is a social process, or as Prof. A. Stewart Woodburne of Crozer Theological Seminary, in a recent article in *The Journal of Religion,* has put it " Salvation Must Be Plural," and no man is saved except as he comes with his arm about a brother. The old song " You get the one next to you and I'll get the one next to me," despite what some have said about its poor music, contains an element of truth which our generation needs to learn. Salvation is a social process.

Will not such a concept of salvation necessitate a change in the content and technique of revivals? We are pleading here not for a new Saviour, but for a new understanding of the salvation which he offers us.

If we try to save ourselves at the expense of the labor of children, apart from the factory-worker in China, unconscious of our debt to the aged, the homeless and the unemployed in our own city, then our way heavenward will be lined with the searching faces of those whose piercing look will haunt us forever.

5. The need is terribly upon us of redefining God in terms of the world in which we live. I am still thinking of a commonwealth recognizing the supremacy of personality. What we think of God is a matter of great moment in the recreation of our commonwealth. Do we believe there are creative epochs and creative individuals and behind them a continually creative God? Is God continually doing a new thing? Is He a part of the process? Or is God resting on his oars, tired with the fight, suffering from fatigue, outside the struggle, observing man with a long telescope? Personality today needs the sense of security which can be found only in going forward with God, who along with man is in the process, struggling, energizing, hoping, and praying with him.

6. Moreover we must make our Christian religion something more than consolation and comfort. The yardstick of the broken-hearted has been too long the measuring-rod to test the value of our gospel. It must be a refuge. We need comfort and consolation, but woe to that man or commonwealth which makes the city of refuge his permanent residence. Our religion at its best is adventure and challenge. Leadership is what men hunger for and need as they work for a commonwealth in which the emphasis of Jesus on personality will be recognized as paramount. It is the only real appeal religion can make to virile youth to equip them for the struggle in behalf of personality. The stuff which goes into the making of a commonwealth will have no place for the demands sent up from behind the lines by a religion which does not assume such leadership.

7. Then too we must find the technique by which we can lead folks to emotional satisfactions and spiritual experiences by attachment to and definite interest in the social struggle over against the emphasis now placed on the subjective, inner experience as being precedent and pre-eminent. We must have good men to build our world, but we are saying that the thrill of being good should arise out of engagement in the conflict. This will mean understanding principles in terms of the concrete, of building faith out of action. Our country is engaged in a great experiment in liberty, but as now constituted it denies justice to large groups. On the other hand the Russian experiment in justice denies liberty to the masses. A commonwealth recognizing the supremacy of personality must seek a synthesis of these two extremes "which shall unite justice and liberty, the rights of the many and of the one, social control and individual initiative." What a field in which to get emotional satisfaction and religious experience in terms of the kingdom of God! One can easily imagine the stimulation of shared experience in midweek service as men and women speak of enriched fellowship with God, of a new understanding of the place and mission of Jesus, and of a new sense of kinship with their fellows which came to be their very own out of attachment to and definite place in the struggle.

8. We will miss out on the commonwealth which we seek unless we quickly redefine the relationship of the church and the state. The lines are converging. We certainly do not want the totalitarian state with its regimentation of life—including the life of the spirit. Neither do we want a commonwealth in which the church will say nothing to the state so long as the state says nothing to the church. The supremacy of personality does not grow in such soil. The state may become, through its many functions, one of the forces which in our modern world damn personality faster than the forces of religion can save it.

We have made much in our talk of the freedom of conscience. We have said many times that man's allegiance to God takes precedence over his allegiance to the state, but that question is being very much debated in these days. We must not labor under delusions of liberty only to awaken to the fact that in the process of social change we have lost that which we cherish most. Can we build a commonwealth which will recognize the supremacy of personality and still perform the functions of a modern state? At present the answer hangs in the balance.

9. Somewhere in the process we must rethink the educational function of the church. A courageous search for truth in every field must spur us on. To my way of thinking this will mean, in addition to a modern study of the Bible and of missionary books and heroes, a definite attempt to have both old and young study social forces and trends, and political strategy. We must point toward a socially intelligent membership. The national council of Congregational churches has recognized this need, as have other denominational bodies in varied ways, by authorizing at their national convention last summer a board or commission on " social study and action " which board is on a par with long recognized boards having to do with home and foreign missions. This may mean new methods in local church organization. A few churches have instituted the forum. Some pastors use the Sunday-night hour for a series of study classes of important social problems which have a bearing on the recognition of personality in any commonwealth. Increasing numbers are using the mid-week-church-night idea as the time of definite adult education in the integration of our Christian ideals with the swirling life around us. A few are making use of the project method in the attempt to make more meaningful the educational function of the church.

One thing is certain, that we cannot leave to the club, to the street-car, and to the office the task of educating the membership of our churches in the elements of a commonwealth recognizing personality as supreme. It becomes increasingly the church's business. There are those who say that a restudy of the educational function of the church will mean a change in worship as to form and content. Worship can be made an undergirding and an uplifting force as men with renewed energy and intelligence seek the Kingdom.

10. Religion which would function in this high task must find a way of making membership more vital. We have already hinted at this in what has been previously said. Who can estimate the drag upon a local church of a large proportion of membership carried on the rolls but in no sense of the word actively in touch with the church unless it be at Christmas or Easter? Ought joining the church to be made more meaningful in

terms of specific things for which the church stands or is there no high common denominator of personal and social living? Ought membership in the church to cost more in definite interest in the church's program of worship, of the search for truth, in its attempt to make social intelligence operative? There are those who advocate church discipline. The Socialist and Communist parties exercise it in order to keep their membership purged and to help the individual member to keep his sense of mission. The Christian church in America could become a vital force in building this commonwealth if we knew how to make membership more vital.

This all sounds, I know, like a statement of the impossible. High and sane religion at its best functions in the area of the impossible. It makes the real out of the unreal. I verily do believe that people are on the march. In the days ahead, how many I do not know, they are coming into their rightful heritage. It is so written in the universe. The stars in their courses are on the side of the people in this struggle. Religion which would be effective in building a commonwealth recognizing the supremacy of personality must touch all life with intelligence, with understanding, and with great passion.

YOGA

Prof. GEORGE W. BRIGGS
Drew University, Madison, N. J.

INTEREST in psychic phenomena has occupied the attention of Indians from time immemorial, and they have devoted much energy to the study and perfection of methods for enducing mystic experiences. Their systems have attracted both the studious and the curious in the West for a very long time. The word Yoga has served to focus attention, in the West as well as in the East, upon these areas of experience, and to encourage the belief that in its methods are to be found ways of apprehending the Reality which lies deep down in the soul. Interest in Yoga is today unabated; and it is not, therefore, out of place to venture upon a brief examination of this ancient science.

There is, in India, the special emphasis upon its physical aspects from the standpoint of *asana* and *mudra,* the use of postures, exercise and contortion for the development of a healthy body, evidenced in the books offered by directors of physical culture (for example, *Asanas and Pranayama,* by Srimat Kuvalyananda, Lonavala, 1933); the interest of the physician who desires to understand the effects of the practice of *asana, mudra* and *pranayama* on the automatic nerve centers, and, ultimately, upon the pulse and the action of the heart (see *Mysterious Kundalini,* by Doctor Rele, 3rd edition, Bombay, 1931); the endeavor of medical men to correlate modern anatomy with the older physiology which uses the terms *cakra, nadi* and *prana;* the effort, through the use of X-ray photography, to discover changes in bodily states which result from yogic exercises; the wide-spread interest in supernormal manifestations resulting from the practice of Yoga, the *aisvarya,* or magic powers which are claimed by certain adepts and recorded in the books; seekers after *moksa* who are attracted to the Yoga; and those who study Yoga as a branch of philosophy, amongst whom are some of the foremost Indian scholars known in the West. There are also the so-called Yogi who is a sleight-of-hand, performing magician, and the adept, who is exceedingly hard to find, who exhibits the supernormal feats which Patanjali and others mention.

In the Occident are to be found many persons who, in a popular sort of way, are dabbling in "Yoga." (See *Eastern Philosophy for Western Minds,* by H. McLaurin, Boston, 1933.) Others, interested in the occult, or esoteric, either limit themselves to Yoga (see *An Introduction to Yoga,*

by C. Blagdon, New York, 1933), or study it in conjunction with other well-known systems of secret lore. (See *Yoga,* by J. F. C. Fuller, London, 1933. First published in 1925.) Some are receiving instruction in Yoga as a method of "correct meditation"; a few are endeavoring to describe yogic elements in Western terms, seeing affinities in words of quite different systems, as for example, Word-with-God or God is equated to *Sabda Brahman,* David with *dvaita,* Son-of-David with *advaita,* Elias with *Bhairava.* (See *The Philosophy of Yoga* and *The Tantric Doctrine of Immaculate Conception,* both by Miss Sharp, London, 1933.) There are some who say that at times like the present, when the authority of religion has been undermined, disillusioned men must turn from external sources to inner reality for light and direction. Consequently, Yoga, especially that of the classical type, is the sure means of refuge from despair. Man, having lost faith in external powers, in religious systems, may turn confidently to his own inner nature and discover in its depths the possibilities for peace and deliverance. The path to these desirable ends lies along the way of his own self-discipline through Yoga. (See *Der Yoga als Heilweg,* Vol. I, by J. W. Hauer, Stuttgart, 1932.) And yet again, those who find psychoanalysis a means to serenity for the frustrated and unhappy see in Yoga similar processes to their own and even a further advance in the science of self-liberation than they themselves have hitherto ventured to make. (See *Yoga and Western Psychology,* by Geraldine Coster, London, 1934.)

A certain amount of secrecy is maintained on the part of those who receive instruction and it is maintained that the secrets of the Yoga cannot be imparted through books but only by a teacher to his pupil. This relation is necessary also because the effects of Yoga discipline are so dangerous and so profound, at certain points, that the presence of the experienced teacher is the only means of safety for the novice.

If we examine books and lectures current in the West, a general survey reveals clearly much vagueness, considerable ignorance, and general reticence concerning certain aspects of Yoga and the meaning of terms. Furthermore, the character of the offerings and the nature of the appeals made in the announcements of teachers show that Patanjali's counsel to avoid the snares of the exercise of powers extraordinary is not always heeded. The following statements, taken from recent handbills, will illustrate this point: "Do you know that you can direct one and one-half million volt current of dynamic energy from your brain to your feet; can learn in four hours how to control mind and body; can overcome all negative habits; can heal yourself of all organic troubles and nervous complaints; can consciously control the vitality of your body; can control

the heart and thus rebuild the astral body; can place the body in cosmic consciousness and *live as long as you desire;* can dwell in the secret Place and vibrate the body to God or Christ Consciousness; can learn to talk with *Universal Almighty Master;* can reach Super-Consciousness and heal others no matter how far away; can accomplish your material financial wishes; and can acquire clairvoyance and clairaudience?" Moreover, students are taught "the control of the Pineal and Pituitary Bodies in order to reach *God or Super-Consciousness;* how to shut off the senses and see the Aura of the Universe; how to reach impersonality and heal humans, plants, and animals or birds with cosmic vitality; (and) how to meet your material needs, how to protect yourself from the danger of the elements, how to rid yourself, your home, or your farm of destructive insects and vermin." It is clear that the Hatha Yoga, rather than that of Patanjali, is the system here offered. Individuals may be found who claim to have mastered the secret of lifting *Kundalini* to the region in the cranial cavity, thereby releasing the spirit through the anterior frontanelle. Such skills are included in "Super Yoga Science." Other claims of teachers in the West may be read in Chapter VI of *Hinduism Invades America* (by Wendell Thomas, New York, 1930).

According to Patanjali, whose work (*Yoga Sutras*) is the fountainhead of Yoga science, there are two general aims of method, supernatural powers and release (*moksa*) or isolation (*kaivalya*), and these are set forth by him in the order named. In the final analysis, the former are passed by as a delusion and a snare to one seeking the highest that the Yoga can yield. Nevertheless they are recognized as valid and desirable. There has always been much interest in the mysterious powers which various stages of the Yoga exhibit.

The following list of supernormal powers is made up from Book Two of Patanjali's *Yoga Sutras* (see Wood's translation in "The Harvard Oriental Series," Boston, 1914. There are many translations): Knowledge of the past and the future; of the cries of all living beings, of previous births, of the thoughts of others, of approaching death, of the subtle, the concealed and the obscure, of cosmic spaces, the ordering of the stars, the arrangements of the human body; indestructibility of his own (the Yogi's) body; the gift of friendliness, extraordinary physical powers, eradication of the demands of the senses, the stopping of the mental processes, visions of perfected adepts, vision of the whole as present and timeless; ability to fly through the air, to dive into earth as into water, to touch the moon with the finger; power over the processes of nature, to become very small or very large, to control the elements

and the products of the elements, and to determine things according to desire, that is, to will actual facts so that the elements which are the evolving causes remain as the Yogi wills; infinitely swift motion; and independence of the powers of others.

Works on Hatha Yoga attach to various practices of the discipline a whole series of powers and effects. For example, in the *Hatha Yoga Pradipika* (from now on *H Y P.*), the following, among others, are named as resulting from the practice of *asana* (posture) and *pranayama* (breath-control): The destruction of the diseases of men, increase of appetite, removal of the diseases of the digestive tract, and those arising from phlegm and bile, constipation, hiccough, asthma, cough, consumption, pain in the head, eyes and ears, leprosy, falling sickness, eradication of fatigue, restoration of youth, elimination of the fear of death and the attainment of immortality. The effects of the most virulent poisons are counteracted, and obesity is reduced.

There is ample evidence to show that manifestations of supernormal powers have been continually present in the minds of those interested in Yoga. This includes experiences of a subtle kind. Professor Dasgupta says: "Throughout all the epochs of Indian culture, we find the highest reverence paid to the Yogins, who were believed not only to possess superior sense, by which they could know the highest truth beyond the ken of ordinary vision, but also to wield the most wonderful, miraculous powers which Patanjali has described as the *vibhutis* of Yoga, by which the Yogin showed his powers not only over his mind and the minds of others, but also over inert, external objects. It was not only superior knowledge that they possessed, but superior powers as well." (*Yoga Philosophy,* Calcutta, 1930.) In works on Hatha Yoga, the accounts show the Yogi watching all along, in almost every stage of the discipline, for subtle reactions, such as intense thrills (excitation of the sex functions), internal sounds and flashes of color. By fixing the attention on these they obtain reactions which lead to unconscious forms of *samadhi.*

However much Yoga as a means to union with God is emphasized, still, for Patanjali, the aim is not union with Isvara ("God"), but absolute separation of the self (*purusa*) from the material world (*prakriti*). This is isolation (*kaivalya*). Isvara serves as an object of devotion, whose aid is lent to the seeker after *moksa.* From the Vedantic point of view, the result of the suppression of mental functions through Yoga is the disappearance of the individual soul (*jiva*), creature of *maya* and *avidya,* there remaining only the impersonal Reality. So far as the individual is concerned, this is *laya,* dissolution. For Patanjali and others the end follows the process of simplifying the mental activities (or states) until

the mind ceases to act. This state is entered for longer and longer periods, until, in death, it becomes final. There the *purusa* has reached *kaivalya.*

The philosophical background of the Yoga is that of the Sankhya. Sankhya and Yoga are commonly treated together, so that the *metaphysic* of the one and the *method* of the other may be correlated. The heart of the philosophy is the dual view of reality as consisting of two discrete eternal entities, one spiritual (a plurality of souls, *purusa*) and the other substance or "matter" (*prakriti*). The one is of the nature of intelligence, but is passive; the other is unintelligent, but active. Their illusory, or deceitful, seeming interlocking constitutes the wandering soul (*jiva*). Here the spiritual principle imagines that it thinks and feels (functions exclusively those of "matter") and substance imagines itself as intelligent (a characteristic of *purusa* only). For the individual soul the problem is the resolution of this false, ultimately unreal, complex (*maya*) in which the soul is bound. The Sankhya achieves this by sheer insight which resolves the seeming person into the eternally discrete realities; the Yoga achieves this end by means of a series of disciplines, which ultimately break down the thinking processes and the other activities of the whole complex of experience which the *purusa* wrongly ascribes to itself.

While Patanjali, in his Yoga, outlines an eight-fold discipline or method to achieve that which the Sankhya attains by intellectual processes only, he recognizes other means to that end as well. These are drugs, spells (*mantra*), trance (*samadhi,* see "Sacred Books of the Hindus," Vol. IV, Allahabad, 1912), and purificatory rites (*tapas*). Tantric Yoga of which Hatha Yoga is a type, that of the left-hand Saktas, includes effects induced by experiences in and meditations on various parts of the body (*cakra*), chiefly those viewed as places of the union of Siva and Sakti. When Yoga is taken with a Vedantic background, as for example in the *Siva Samhita* (translation in the "Sacred Books of the Hindus," Allahabad, 1923), *purusa* and *prakriti,* Siva and Sakti, are carried up into a higher synthesis through the union of the two. This may be viewed as a reversal of the process in which Brahman in taking diverse forms passes first through the modification *ardhanari* (half female and half male).

Principles of Yoga run through Indian religious practice from ancient times and its significance has been fairly uniform although its details of expression have varied in the systems, Jain, Buddhist and Brahman, in which it has been used. The word "Yoga" is a technical term with a specific general meaning. Professor Edgerton (see his article, "The Meaning of Sankhya and Yoga," in *The American Journal of Philology,* 1924. His phraseology has been used freely) says that it signifies a method, a way of disciplined activity whereby an end is attained, usually *moksa,* or, more

popularly, some power or skill or experience. It is not an end or an aim that is referred to by Yoga, but the disciplined action or activity which leads to the end desired. For example, this is its use in important parts of the *Great Epic,* such as the *Bhagavad Gita* and the *Moksadharma* section of Book Twelve. It is common knowledge that from early times (see *Svetasvatara* and later Upanishads) Sankhya and Yoga refer to two methods of reaching *mukti* (*moksa*), the one the method of knowledge, the other that of action. Sankhya in the *Gita* means the way of salvation by pure knowledge, the intellectual method, and it is understood as implying quietism, renunciation of action (*sannyasa, vairagya*). Yoga, on the other hand, is understood as disciplined, unselfish activity. Here *yoga* is synonymous with *karma-yoga,* "discipline of action." It is a course of procedure characterized by action without interest in its fruits. The argument which Krishna advances to Arjuna is that in life action is inevitable, but that it must be brought under a rule of conduct (*dharma*) suitable to Arjuna's station in life, engagement in battle. Yoga in the *Epic* is always a way, a method of getting something. The common denominator of all the *Epic* definitions of Yoga is *disciplined activity, earnest striving*—by *active* (not rationalistic or intellectual) means:

> "In this world a twofold foundation (of religious salvation) [Sankara's rendering is "two kinds of fixed rule"] has been expounded by me of old: by the discipline of *knowledge* of the followers of Sankhya, and by the discipline of *action* of the followers of Yoga." (*Gita, III. 3.* Edgerton's translation.)

Professor Hiriyanna in his *Outlines of Indian Philosophy* (New York, 1932), says that the *Gita* would lose its entire significance if action were not regarded as its essential lesson. And he holds that the central point of the teaching is activism, *karma-yoga.* He goes on to define *karma* in terms of duties prescribed by custom and tradition, the *varna-dharmas* (the specific customary duties of the various orders of society). So that *karma-yoga* in the *Gita* means "harnessing" or "applying oneself to" social obligations. The concern of the individual is solely with the action, never with its fruits. Professor Dasgupta (*A History of Indian Philosophy,* Vol. I, Cambridge, 1922), in speaking of *samadhi* as a state of release (*kaivalya*), says that what the Sankhya aims to gain through knowledge, the Yoga achieves through the perfected discipline of the will and psychological control of the mental processes (states).

The idea of discipline is earlier than the *Gita,* and, of course, than the *Yoga Sutras* of Patanjali. Thomas (*The History of Buddhist Thought,* New York, 1933) points out that the Buddhists acted on the assumption that Truth or Truths of their outlook could be realized only through a

course of moral and intellectual discipline; and that the practice of mental training was already known in the Brahmanistic schools and probably in others by the name of "Yoga." It was training in the "yoking" of the mental processes to an object and so controlling the attention as to exclude everything else. He notes that nothing in the word Yoga implies religious experience; that although it was practiced by sects as a means of attaining union with God, its sense of yoking naturally developed the meaning of union; still, as in the *Bhagavad Gita,* it denotes rather the process of attaining that union than that end itself.

In the *Svetasvatara* (and in later Upanishads) this tendency is emphasized, for in them Yoga has come to be regarded as a method of attaining salvation. Professor Dasgupta says: "We find a whole series of Upanishads which grew up after the *Maitrayani* and dealt exclusively with the Yoga discipline with little reference to the Sankhya metaphysics. [They] (nine Upanishads are named) are all busy in describing the Yoga philosophy and the practical methods of attaining concentration. In these the philosophical aspect has been largely subordinated to the elaborate physical processes of Yoga, which began to grow almost independently of Patanjali's treatment of the subject and were accepted and assimilated later on by the sectarian schools of the Shaktas and Shaivas and also by some later schools of Buddhists." (*Yoga Philosophy,* pp. 40, 41.)

The second point, brought out by Professor Edgerton in the article already mentioned, is that *yoga* does not mean "union"; although in English we may describe the *goal* of Yoga as "union" (with Brahman or God), still, in Sanskrit, the word *yoga* and its cognates are *not* ordinarily used of this. Instead, the emancipated soul "goes to" (*adhi gam*), "attains" (*ap, prap*), or "sees" (*pas*) Brahman; or if he is said to attain "oneness, sameness" with Brahman, the word used is not *yoga* but, e. g., *samyata.* Hopkins pointed out (*J. A. O. S.,* 22, 334), that the union-idea of the author of the *Mundaka Upanishad* is expressed not by *yoga* but by *samya;* and Professor Radhakrishnan says (*Indian Philosophy,* Vol. II) that in Patanjali *yoga* means effort only, not union. Carpentier has shown (*Z. D. M. G.,* 65, 846f.) that not only in the *Epic* but even later the word *yoga* does not mean "union."

In the fourth or fifth century of our era Patanjali the philosopher wrote his *Yoga Sutras.* In this work he sets forth a graded series of eight exercises or disciplines whose mastering in turn lead to *kaivalya,* his view of the nature of *moksa.* These disciplines are *yama, niyama, asana, pranayama, pratyahara, dharana, dhyana* and *samadhi.* That these are not original with him is clear from references in earlier literature. In fact, the *Yoga Sutras* are not regarded as an original work, but rather as a

compilation. And in the series under his eight heads, and in the subdivisions under these, are to be found many exercises well-known at the time, some of considerable age, a few of great antiquity. Patanjali's series is not exhaustive, and some practices which he omitted have appeared in later systems of Yoga.

In this series of eight, each discipline is to be perfected before the next, in order. The eight may be characterized as follows: *Yama* and *niyama* comprise a sort of ten commandments, made up of abstinences and observances. The former are from injuring anything (*ahimsa*), from falsehood or deceit, from theft, from sexual intercourse, and from covetousness. The latter involve necessary religious duties and self-restraint. These conduce to cleanness of mind, contentment, moderation, and frugality; to the habit of bearing all privations of cold and heat equally, keeping the body unmoved, silence and asceticism; the study of philosophy; the keeping of fasts and observances, the recitation of spells and words, among others the repetition of the mystic syllable *OM;* and to meditation on Isvara which gives perfection of concentration, devotion to god, and resignation to his will.

If obstacles arise while practicing *niyama* (or *yama*) resort should be made to the principle of using the opposite quality and thinking of consequences as deterrents.

Having mastered these preliminary requirements, the Yogi begins the Yoga proper. *Asana* refers to postures or positions suitable for meditation, or conducive to physical health through exercises (*mudra* and *bandha*). Some postures are really feats of physical skill. A great many *asanas* and *mudras* are described in the books. *Pranayama* refers to the means of the control of the breath, especially of the holding of the in-filled breath. Its aim is to regulate and finally to stop the process. The theory is that breathing is a disturbing element, interfering with the *fixing* of the mental processes. *Pratyahara* aims at the severance of contacts between the senses and their objects, at *indifference* to all external influences. *Dharana, dhyana* and *samadhi* are graded skills in the fixing of the attention, the gaining of power in the suppression of all mental activity. Being in the state of *samadhi* at the time of death, the Yogi passes into *kaivalya.*

The final state, according to Patanjali, is not one of bliss, for feeling belongs to *prakriti,* not to *purusa.* It is a state of pure intelligence achieved through discipline of the will and psychological control of the mental states, a suppression of the mind which carries one beyond the psychic life. (See *A History of Indian Philosophy,* Vol. I, by Dasgupta.) *Purusa's* liberation is the ultimate purpose of the evolution of *prakriti*

(the material order, or that in which experience is had); and *kaivalya,* aloofness from *prakriti,* escape from the realm of suffering, is the ultimate goal. And this is absolute indifference—*kaivalya.* (See *Outlines of Indian Philosophy.*) Patanjali says (*Yoga Sutras,* I. 2), "Yoga is the destruction (suppression, *nirodha*) of (all) mental processes."

Patanjali's *Yoga Sutras* embody the so-called classical form of Yoga; other systems build around this, laying emphasis upon specific disciplines and effects, and including at various stages supplementary and ancilliary activities. It may be stated as a general proposition that each of the systems has as a background the whole of Patanjali, but is characterized by its special practices and emphasis. The *H Y P.* holds in antithesis the Hatha and the Raja Yoga. The former includes *asana* and *pranayama,* greatly elaborated; the latter comprises *dharana, dhyana* and *samadhi.* The *H Y P.* says that Raja Yoga is reached through the mastery of *asana* and *pranayama.* The *Gheranda Samhita* says "the Hatha Yoga stands out as a ladder that leads to the highest heights of Raja Yoga." The two are complementary and mutually indispensable for the attainment of perfection.

It is customary to speak of numerous types of Yoga, such as Hatha, Raja, Karma, Jnana, Mantra, Bhakti, Kundalini, and Laya Yoga. The first three of these have been characterized already. Jnana Yoga refers to the discipline of knowledge with the abandonment of action. Mantra Yoga makes use of separate sounds, syllables and sacred verses as a means to concentration. Related to the doctrine of *Sabda,* these have intrinsic powers of their own and are helpful from that angle also. Bhakti Yoga lays special emphasis upon devotion, loving meditation, as a means of concentration. Laya Yoga gives attention to methods and ends of discipline which issue in dissolution (*laya*) of the conscious life or "absorption" of the soul. "*Laya* is simply a forgetting of the objects of the senses when the desires do not rise into existence again." (*H Y P.,* 4. 33.) Kundalini Yoga aims at the "raising" of *Kundalini* to the cranial cavity. In the Hatha Yoga, it will be noted, all of these methods are employed.

In order to understand the technique of the Yoga, it is necessary to consider certain terms which are in constant use. Nearly all of them appear as early as the Upanishads of the Buddha's time, most of them are known to Patanjali, all of them are of prime importance in later systems like the Hatha Yoga. These may be grouped primarily as: (1) Physiological, such as *prana, nadi, cakra, bindu, rajas* and *kundalini;* (2) those relating to bodily purification and physical and mental control, such as *asana, mudra, bandha, dhauti, pranayama, mantra* and *japa;* and (3) those describing effects, such as *nada, anahata nada,* the effects of *khecari-mudra* and of *pranayama* and *samadhi.*

The exercises of the Hatha Yoga are usually complex, including the use together of *asana, mudra, bandha, dhauti, pranayama, mantra,* and *japa.* The details of practice may be found in translations of the *H Y P.,* the *Gheranda Samhita* (*Gh. S.*), and the *Siva Samhita* (*S. S.*) in the series "Sacred Books of the Hindus," published in Allahabad; in the *Goraksa Sataka* (*Go. S.*), in Arthur Avalon's, *Serpent Power, Shakti and Shakta;* and in other works of Tantra. The first four listed here are authoritative works on the Hatha Yoga. The reason for using, in this account, the Hatha Yoga rather than the Yoga of Patanjali is that popular interest lies here. The theory of the Hatha Yoga, broadly speaking, is that *samadhi* can be attained by purification of the physical body and certain physical exercises.

Prana means breath, and also vital force, life. It is described under a number of special terms (ten of which are well-known) denoting vital functions such as respiration, digestion, vision, and so on. *Prana,* the breath of the respiratory tracts, is that of primary importance in the Yoga. The vital forces move within the body in channels, or paths, called *nadi.* These are innumerable, but there are three which concern the Yogi—*ida, pingla* and *susumna.* The first two carry the male and female energies of the body; the third, the most important, contains the channel which extends the length of the spinal column, popularly viewed as the core of the spinal cord. The forces of the other two are to be controlled so as to be conveyed into the *susumna.* This *nadi* extends from the aperture of the male organ to the cavity within the skull, passing through all the *cakras,* and issues in the *sahasrara,* the one-thousand-petaled lotus (or *cakra*) situated at the anterior frontanelle. It is through this opening that the spirit escapes in liberation. *Ida* and *pingla* are called moon and sun. The male energy is called "nectar of the moon," *bindu,* realistically semen. It is secreted in the region above the soft palate. The female energy is distilled in the place of the sun, of fire, in the region of the navel (*nabi-cakra*). It is called *rajas* (red). The symbolism of the Hatha Yoga swings around the idea of the union of these two energies, *bindu* and *rajas,* at various levels in the body. These levels are called *cakra* (circles, wheels), and *padma* (lotus) and are named as follows: *muladhara,* at the base (*mula*) of the trunk; *svardhisthana,* at the root of the male organ; *manipuraka,* in the region of the navel; *anahata,* the heart lotus; *visuddha,* in the throat; *ajna,* between the eyebrows, within the cranium, and the *sahasradhara* or thousand-petaled lotus opening downward with its filament extending upward, located at the anterior frontanelle. The lotuses contain the symbols of male and female energies, and are presided over by male and female deities. Within the circles are letters with *bindu,* the *bija* or seed

mantras of the various *cakras.* They have characteristic coloring. The petals of the lotuses vary from two to one thousand in number, each petal having a letter with its *bindu.* The symbolism includes the *yoni,* usually as an inverted triangle, the *linga,* circles, disks of the moon and animals, some fabulous, as the many-tusked elephant of India. (See the Plates in *The Serpent Power,* by Arthur Avalon, London, 1919.) To each of the *cakras* a peculiar type of creative experience is assigned, which is subject to realization through meditation upon it.

The female creative energy, *sakti,* which is so important an element in this Yoga, is called, among other things, *Kundalini,* the Coiled-She-Serpent. Ordinarily she is asleep in the *muladhara,* coiled around the *linga* with her head (mouth) closing the aperture. (See Plate II, among those referred to above.) Aroused, she drinks the nectar of the moon (*bindu*). This union is the experience of creation, which typifies the "union" of Yoga. The degree of the subtileness of this experience depends upon the level at which it occurs. But in each case there is the realization of the union of Siva and Parvati, the Goddess (*Sakti*). She drinks the nectar in the *muladhara* or at the level to which she is "lifted." For the adept, *bindu* is to be held in its place of origin and *Kundalini* is raised through the *susumna* to that high level. Here the experience is very subtile. But she may be lifted further and as she moves the experience becomes refined more and more in character until the differentiation, male-female, Siva-Parvati, is dissolved and unity is attained.

The best means of arousing *Kundalini* is through the use of *asana* (including *mudra* and *bandha*) and *pranayama.* The "air" must move in the middle channel (*susumna*). To this end the *nadis* must be cleansed. In many cases *dhautis,* special means of cleansing the alimentary and respiratory tracts, are required. (These are usually given as six in number.) The use of a long, narrow tape which is swallowed and drawn up again to cleanse the upper portion of the digestive tract may be taken as an illustration.

Pranayama, however, is the most effective both as a means for the purification of the *nadis,* and at the same time as sure means of awakening *Kundalini.* The important element in this discipline is the holding of the in-filled air. "Restraint of the breath is the cutting off of the flow of those two (inspiration and expiration)" (*Yoga Sutra* 2. 49). By practice this can be prolonged, the books and the adepts say, for varying periods of time, "even for years." (Dasgupta, *A History of Indian Philosophy,* Vol. I, p. 272.) There is in this condition no distraction of the mind, so it conduces to fixity of attention.

The Yogi is intent upon the "moving" (*Sakticalana*) of *Kunda-*

lini. Asana, mudra are used as means to bodily rigidity, and for the acquirement of the steadiness and strength necessary to this difficult and trying activity; *mudra* and *bandha* (contortion and stoppage) serve to check the vital processes such as movements of the breath and *bindu.*

The repetition of *mantras* like the *gayatri* and of syllables such as *om* and *hamsah* (and many others—each *cakra* has a central one) and the silent repetition of syllables or sounds, *ajapa,* serve as means of fixing attention. Their intimate connection with *pranayama* is illustrated through the *mantra hamsah.* "With the sound 'ha' the *jiva* goes out; with the sound of 'sa' it enters the body again. The *jiva* repeats continually the *mantra hamsah, hamsah.* The *jiva* recites continually this *mantra* twenty-one thousand six hundred times in a day and a night." (*Go. S.* 42, 43.) Although *hamsah* is related directly to the breath, it has its rise in the place of origin of sexual desire, *svadhisthana;* it is the chief *mantra* of *jiva* (life, or soul). It is the *ajapa* (the inarticulate) *gayatri.* Besides the effects of the stoppages, including that of the breath, is the production of subtile, internal sounds, *nada.* Fixing the attention on these results in ecstasy, in trance, in *laya.*

Two interests are kept in mind and are inextricably intermingled in the minds of Yogis. The one is that expressed in the sex symbolism and *Kundalini,* the other that of mental fixation, and both ultimately involving the same end, *samadhi.* The writers shift from one to the other and mix the development of both so that it is often difficult to separate them. It is clear that there are two aspects of this system. The one looks to *experiences* which are interpreted as various degrees of realization of *samadhi,* and the ultimate experience of *samadhi,* through the fixing of attention. Unusual powers manifest themselves at all levels of experience, and in the end there comes *moksa.* When a Yogi dies, his body is not cremated, but buried in the posture (*asana*) of meditation, for, it is held, he has entered into the final or interminable state of *samadhi.* He is in *kaivalya* or *laya.* At all other times before this, he has returned to consciousness. But, as an adept, he has been entering for longer periods into *samadhi,* and has finally reached perfection and there will be no return.

The symbolism of the Hatha Yoga is expressed in terms of certain positive and negative forces within the body whose union brings subtler and subtler experiences as the Yogi proceeds with the mastery of his discipline. But there is no doubt that this Yoga is associated with the Sakta rites of the "left-hand" type. And experience actually at the *muladhara* level is not despised. As did mendicants at earlier times, so Yogis believe in both enjoyment and release. In some schools of the Buddhist it was held that arahatship could be reached even while the seeker

was enjoying himself (*kama-bhogin*). The Yogi has similar views. He rises through *yama* and *niyama* and the rest of the disciplines until he becomes an adept. He can then indulge in such rites as *sri-cakra* (the rite involving wine, flesh, fish, contortion and sexual union) and *vajroli* (see below) to his eternal benefit while the undisciplined performs the same rites and acts to his destruction. The two cycles of activity, that which looks to the moving of *Kundalini,* and that which looks to fixed attention, will be illustrated by quotations from the *H Y P.,* one of the best-known texts of the Hatha Yoga. Since immortality and the higher yogic experiences are dependent upon the preservation of the *bindu* within the body, some means must be employed to achieve this end. Either the *bindu* discharged in *maithuna* must be brought back into the body, or its course downward must be checked, or it must not be allowed to move downward. To achieve the first of these ends the Yogi must undergo a most thorough physical training embracing certain asanas and mudras. He may then practice *vajroli* and its variants, *sahajoli* and *amaroli.* These are described in the first three works listed above. Even if as Iyangar says (*H Y P.,* Madras, 1933) these exercises are not literally physical, although their practice is admitted, still there is no doubt that the sex functions are greatly stimulated by the exercises described. "By the loss of *bindu* (comes) death, from its retention, life. . . Where is the fear of death so long as the *bindu* remains in the body? The *bindu* of man (is) dependent upon mind (and) life upon *bindu.* Therefore both *bindu* and *manas* are to be protected in every way." (*H Y P.,* 3. 87, 88 and 89.)

To prevent the downward course of *bindu,* the *khecari-mudra* is of great value. It makes for freedom also. This is in many ways the chief *mudra* whose continued practice produces Yoga trance, the state resembling hibernation. Apparently this is the practice which is used in the exhibitions of suspended animation which have been reported to the West, for the practice of this *mudra* results in the suppression of the breath and insensibility, so that the Yogi may be buried in the ground without air, food or drink. The description of this *mudra* is as follows: "By turning the tongue over backward into the hollow above the throat, and by fixing the sight between the eyebrows, is the *khecari-mudra* performed." (*Go. S.,* 64.) "As fire cleaves to the wood and as a light to oil and wick, so the soul does not leave the body full of the drops of *soma* (*bindu*)." (*H Y P.,* 3. 45.) Preliminary to the practice, the fraenum of the tongue is to be cut. This is done a little at a time with a bamboo sharp edge. Then the tongue is kneaded and stretched so as to permanently increase its length. "Having turned the tip of the tongue upward, (the Yogi) closes the three passages.[1]

[1] Including the channel (*susumna*) through which *bindu* descends.

This is the *khecari-mudra* and it is called the *vyoma cakra.* The Yogi, who remains even for a moment with his tongue turned upwards thus, is saved from poisons, diseases, death, old age, etc. He who knows the *khecari-mudra* is without disease, death, lassitude, sleep, hunger, thirst or swooning. He who knows *khecari-mudra* is neither beset by disease nor tainted by *karma* nor snared by death. This *mudra, khecari* by name, has been desired by adepts because, when it is practiced, the mind goes to *aksa* (*khe*) (when) the tongue reaches *khe.* Above the throat is the space, *akasa,* or vacuum (*khe*) where limitation of sense is removed." (*H Y P.,* 3. 37-40.)

Here, then, is ecstatic experience which is beyond the range of the senses and which does not entail death. "While the *bindu* remains in the body, there is no fear of death. As long as the *khecari-mudra* is continued, so long the *bindu* does not go down." (*Go. S.,* 70.)

In order to understand the meaning of *anahata nada* and its cause it is necessary to look briefly at *pranayama.* Although a great deal of attention is given to this in the texts, but brief references will be made here. There are many variations in the combinations of *mudra, asana, bandha* and other exercises with the *pranayama.* The details of use of the *ida* and *pingla* in the breathing process are omitted also. "(The Yogi) should practice holdings of the breath (*kumbhakan*) four times a day, at dawn, in the middle of the day, at evening and at midnight, gradually up to eighty times (that is 320 for the twenty-four hours)." (*H Y P., 2.* 11.) When the adept is able to deal with *kumbhaka* without infilling or expelling the air, he has reached the point of mastery where "there is nothing whatsoever in the three worlds difficult for him to attain" (*H Y P.,* 2.74), for he is able to keep the breath (*vayu*) confined at will. This leads to *anahata nada* (certain internal sounds) and success may be achieved within a year. The air is directed into the *susumna,* and steadiness of mind is a result of the free movement of the *prana* in the middle path (*susumna*). That is the *manonmani* (the state in which there is perfect fixity of mind).

Great store is laid by *anahata nada* or the sound (*nada*) in the heart lotus. "*Anahata nada* is awakened by the exercise of *pranayama.* A couple of weeks' practice with eighty *pranayamas* in the morning and the same number in the evening will cause distinct sounds to be heard; and, as the practice goes on increasing, varied sounds become audible to the practiser. By hearing these sounds attentively (i. e., fixing the attention on them), one gets concentration of the mind, and thence *sahaja samadhi.* When Yoga-sleep is experienced, the student should give himself up to it and make no efforts to check it. By and by, these sounds become subtile and they become less and less intense, so the mind loses its waywardness and

becomes calm and docile; and, on this practice becoming well-established, *samadhi* becomes a voluntary act. This is, however, the highest stage and is the lot of the favored and fortunate few only." (*H Y P.* Introduction, p. iv. Panini Press Edition.)

The end of the Hatha Yoga is the Raja Yoga, ecstacy and trance, the experience of Brahma. "I will now describe the best course (leading up) to *samadhi,* the destroyer of death, a means to peace, producer of the supreme *Brahmananda.*" (*H Y P.,* 4. 2.) "Just as with salt in water all becomes salty, so the mingling of *atma* and *manas* is denominated *samadhi.* When the breath (*prana*) becomes exhausted and the mental processes (*manas*) are brought to rest, then their being equal (i. e., the same) is called *samadhi.* And this equality, (this) oneness of the two, the living self and the absolute self, when all desire (*samkalpa*) is destroyed, is called *samadhi.*" (*H Y P.,* 4. 4-7.)

It is of interest to note how intimately the processes of the Kundalini Yoga are related to the attainment of bliss. "By practice through various postures (*asana*) and holdings of the breath, *Kundalini* being aroused, the *prana* is absorbed in *sunya* (i. e., *samadhi*). (This) state of emptiness (*samadhi*) of Yogis who experience the aroused Sakti, and all of whose actions are renounced, is achieved even of its own accord. When the *prana* moves in the *susumna* and mental action (*manasa*) is absorbed in *sunya,* then the adept uproots all effects of works. When the mind has reached tranquillity (ceases to act) and the breath moves in the middle channel (*susumna*), *amaroli, vajroli* and *sahajoli* are accomplished. How can there be knowledge (*samadhi*) as long as the brain works here, as long as *prana* moves, before mental activity is dead (*mriyate na*)? He alone who can lead these two, his *prana* and *manas,* to dissolution (*vi-laya*) achieves *moksa.*" (*H Y P.,* 4. 10, 11, 12, 14, 15.)

The heart of the practice is made clear in the following verses: "Only when the *prana* moves in the *susumna* is *manonmani* perfected, but [by] no other discipline (or efforts) of Yogis whatever. Who has brought his breath to a stop has, at the same time, brought his mental activities to rest; who has brought his mental activities to repose, has stopped down his breath. As mental activity is dissolved, the breath is stilled. As the *prana* is stopped, the mind is brought to dissolution. As milk and water unite (and become one) likewise do these two, *manas* and *prana.* As (does) the breath (*maruta*) so (does) the mind (*manas*) behave. As the mind so the breath acts. From the suppression (lit., destruction) of the one that of the other (follows). When both are active (i. e., not absorbed), the *indriyas* (faculties of sense and volition) perform their

functions; both disappearing the state (level) of *moksa* (i. e., *samadhi*) is achieved. When the mind is fixed and the breathing ceases, the *bindu* is retained (i. e., unmoved); from the stabilization of the *bindu* always true fixity of the body is produced. Mind (*manas*) is the master of the faculties of sense and volition; and breath is master of the mind; the master of the breath is *laya* (dissolution) and *laya* depends upon *nada* (*anahata,* sound). This itself (*laya*) is what is called *moksa*. . . When mind and breath have been absorbed, a sort of ecstasy (*ananda*) is experienced. With the ceasing of respiration, with the destruction of the range of the senses, and with the mind inactive and changeless, one wins the *laya* of Yogis. For (the Yogi) all of whose effects of deeds are destroyed, and whose actions have ceased, *laya,* self-engendered and indescribable, is won." (*H Y P.,* 4. 20, 21, 23-25, 28-32.)

The state, induced by *khecari-mudra,* is described at length and is identified with various technical expressions. " Between the eyebrows is the seat of Siva and there the mind (*manas*) is absorbed (*vi-laya*). This condition (*padam*) should be recognized as *turya* (*samadhi*). Then death is not known. One should practice the *khecari* until *Yoga-nidra* (sleep) (i. e., *samadhi*) is (induced). Under no circumstances is there death for (the Yogi) who has reached (i. e., is in) *Yoga nidra.* Freeing the mind from all contacts, (the Yogi) should meditate on nothing at all. Like a pot in space (*vyoman*) (with ether) both without and within, one should remain fixed. When the air outside the body is absolutely still like that within, the mind with the breath becomes fixed in its own place (? in the top of the skull). Consequently (the Yogi), should practice day and night in the way of breath-control. The breath is dissolved and the mind is absorbed."

And again, " Concentrating the mind in Sakti (*Kundalini*) and the Sakti within the mind, and looking upon the mind with the mind (the Yogi) should reach the highest state. Hold the *atman* with the *kha* (*akasa*) and the *kha* within the *atman,* and making all this *kha* (this is union above the throat) (the Yogi) should think of nothing whatsoever. (The Yogi) should become void within, void without, void like a pot in space; full within, full without, full like a pot in space. There is to be thought neither upon things external nor things internal; having abandoned all thought (the Yogi) should think upon nothing whatever. (This) entire world (is) but the sport of the brain; (all) mental enjoyments are simply formed within the brain. Abandon (all) these (merely) mental creations utterly. Resolutely refusing to resort (to these), O Rama attain peace. As camphor in fire, (as) salt in water, so the mental acts commingled are absorbed in Reality. The mind takes delight in knowledge,

all that is known and that to be known. What is known and what is to be known are equally to be destroyed. There is no other, no second way. All this which is seen, whatever moves and that which is movable, is merely mental. He whose mental state is one of unity knows no duality whatsoever." (*H Y P.*, 4. 53-60.)

Returning now to the experience of *nada* and its relation to *samadhi*, the following verses are of interest: "For reaching the *unmani* (state where the mental process is stopped) quickly, fixing (the attention) upon the space between the eyebrows is, in my opinion, the best: for the gaining of the level of Raja Yoga it is an easy method for people of little (i. e., irresolute) minds. The absorption (*laya*) produced from *nada* wins immediately the firm assurance of union. Upon the sound of a drum which the Yogi hears when he closes his ears with his fingers (hands) the attention should be held fixedly until the state of inaction is reached. In the practice of this *nada* external sounds are shut out. . . When practice first begins the *nada* gives a great variety of very loud (sounds). Then, as the discipline continues, more and more subtile sounds are heard. In the first (stage) the (sounds) produced are like the rolling (thunder-cloud sound) of kettle-drums and the *jharjhara* (a drum). In the second (stage) they are like those arising from the shaking of small bells, the conch and the *mrdanga* (a drum). But, finally, they sound like those of the (buzzing of) the black bee, the *vina* (flute) and small bells. These various sounds are heard as arising within the body. Even though listening for loud (sounds) like the rolling sounds of kettle-drums, still (the Yogi) should seek (practice) (to hear, to listen to) also the most subtile ones. Dispensing with the heavier ones for the subtile, or the subtile for the heavier, even the mind distracted with pleasure should not wander anywhere else. Anywhere where the mind first comes in contact with the *nada*, right there becoming fixed it is absorbed with it. As the black bee, drinking the honey, does not notice its perfume, so likewise when the mind is joined with *nada* (is intent or listening to *nada* only), other objects are desired not at all. The mind, wandering in the garden of the objects of sense, like a rutting elephant, can be brought under control by the sharp elephant-goad of this (*anahata*) *nada*. For the mind, taken in the snare of the *nada*, having abandoned all fickleness (unsteadiness) becomes steadfast immediately, as a bird whose wings have been clipped. Having abandoned all anxieties (thoughts), with the mind collected, (Yogis) who are desirous of the dominion of Yoga, should consider this *nada* worthy of investigation. *Nada* becomes a snare for *bindu*, the mind, like the spotted antelope; and it can also slay it, as the (snared) antelope is slain." (*H Y P.*, 4. 79, 81-93.)

The final state is described: "From continuous practice of the *nada,* the whole store of demerit is wiped out, and the breath and the mind are surely absorbed in the Supreme Being (*niranjane*). (The Yogi) hears neither the conch nor the drum at all. Being fixed in the state of *unmani* (mental inaction) (his) body becomes like a piece of wood. Free from all states, exempt from all anxiety, that Yogi is as one dead, verily not other than liberated. He is neither consumed by death nor snared by (his) deeds. The Yogi, lost in *samadhi,* is not overcome by anything. The Yogi who is lost in *samadhi* is conscious of neither smell nor taste nor form (or color) nor feeling (touch) nor sound nor himself nor the Highest. (The Yogi), whose mind is neither sleeping nor waking, remembering nor avoiding remembering, sitting down nor rising up, is indeed a liberated man. The Yogi who is lost in *samadhi* does not distinguish cold from heat, misery from comfort, honour from dishonour. He is verily free, who being himself really awake, appears like one sleeping, and who is without in- and out-breathing. The Yogi engaged in *samadhi* can not be controlled by charms (*yantra*) and spells (*mantra*), is beyond the power of all corporeal beings and is immune from all weapons. Just as long as the moving air does not enter the *susumna,* just so long the *bindu* is not stable, because the *prana* is not stopped; as long as in *dhyana* (absorbed attention) spontaneously the form of Brahma (*tattva*) does not appear,—so long he who speaks of knowledge is a babbler of that 'knowledge' which is both futile and deceptive." (*H Y P.,* 4. 104-113.)

GETHSEMANE

MARTIN DIBELIUS, Heidelberg, Germany
Translated by MORTON S. ENSLIN

THE story of Jesus' prayer and of the disciples' sleep in Gethsemane has been explained in many different ways. The naive writer and the artist have always viewed it with warm appreciation; theologians have often combined with it the idea of vicarious suffering; Ambrose indeed felt obliged to insist for Luke 22:42: "He suffered that for me, since for himself he had nothing to suffer." The critics have considered the question of historicity with very different results. Many have pointed out that there was no eye-witness present, for the sleeping disciples could not qualify as witnesses. Others declared that no Christian would have invented such a scene, for it is opposed to any glorification of Jesus. Origen in fact praised the evangelist's love of truth on precisely this ground (*Contra Celsum* II, 24).

What the method which we in Germany call the method of Form criticism has to set in contrast to these appraisals is one very simple question: Should it not be possible to detect from the type of the story the aim of the narrator, and hence from the style of the story to infer its real meaning? We disregard first of all the possibility that there may have existed prior to Mark a story of the suffering of Jesus and start from Mark as the oldest account we know.

Mark begins by calling the place Gethsemane and describes how Jesus with his three intimate friends parted from the rest of the disciples. The real center of the narrative lies in that affecting scene which includes Jesus' lament, his prayer, and, after his first return from prayer, the word of warning to the sleeping disciples, "Watch and pray." Then follows the repetition of the prayer and the return once more to the sleepers—this is told briefly and without emphasis; finally very brief mention of a third return (the third prayer is presupposed but not mentioned). The final word of Jesus concludes the scene.

Therefore Mark 14:33-38—lament, prayer, and warning—forms the center of the narrative. At the same time it is noticeable that the first two sections are twice repeated: indirectly—"he began to be greatly amazed, and sore troubled," "he prayed that, if it were possible, the hour might pass away from him"—and in direct discourse. The narrator accordingly has considered it very important to depict the agony of Jesus as it finds expression in lament and prayer. What he has not depicted

is a strengthening and comforting of Jesus. And thus we are already far removed from the ordinary opinion. For it is customary to think of the strengthening angel (Luke 22:43) and to interpret the whole scene on this basis; Mark however says nothing of any such divine aid! He calls special attention to real human weakness only in the disciples who cannot watch with the Master. And this weakness is not extenuated, and the weak disciples are not consoled; on the contrary the scene ends with an ironic reproach: "Do ye wish to sleep on and take your rest? (Or, with even greater irony, Sleep on now and have out your rest!) Now it is at an end (literally, 'it is enough'—obviously in connection with something entirely self-evident, hence probably with the sleep or the stay in the garden), the hour is come!" If the human weakness of the disciples is thus reproved, the narrator cannot wish to ascribe a weakness of precisely the same sort to the Master. Thus Jesus too is not comforted or strengthened; but shows his submission to the will of God in prayer, shows also his attitude in the closing word—he has remained strong in spite of all his agony. Therefore the prayer is not an expression of Jesus' weakness. And the lament which precedes it is also no sign of despair; it is not corrected through the prayer in some way or other so that first Jesus' weakness would be mentioned, then his strengthening. On the contrary, lament and prayer (Mark 14:33, 34 and Mark 14:35, 36) are perfectly clearly parallels, and show the same attitude. One says as much as the other. This whole scene has accordingly a positive significance: it does not indicate the admission of a conscientious historian that even Jesus once became weak. On the contrary it is told in *honor of Jesus.*

Indeed nothing else can be expected in the passion narrative. For the passion is not told to give a record of all sorts of events or to represent psychologically Jesus' moods. The story of the passion, especially in Mark, has only this one aim: it aims to proclaim that even in this enigmatic and awful event God's will is accomplished for the salvation of man (cf. for this point my book *From Tradition to Gospel,* pp. 178ff.). Moreover what is recounted of Jesus' agony in Gethsemane must serve this aim—otherwise it would not have been told.

Is such a positive evaluation of the scene conceivable? Is it imaginable that fright and fear and a plea for deliverance were regarded as signs of the fulfilment of the divine will?

That this is possible is proved by the one passage in the epistles of the New Testament which contains an allusion to this or to a similar event —and an allusion indeed with Christological intent (*Tendenz*)! This is Hebrews 4:14 to 5:10. The governing idea of the passage is, as is well known: Our high priest can sympathize with us, for he knows the

infirmities with which we have to fight. As such infirmities the temptations of Jesus are mentioned in 4:15, and in 5:7 the crying and weeping with which he offered his prayer to the one who could save him from death. The point of this allusion is evident from the comparison of the earthly high priest with the heavenly one. The earthly high priest is descended from men; our high priest Christ has experienced days of human existence ("in the days of his flesh"). The earthly high priest offers sacrifices; the other our prayers and supplications. Both, however, are appointed by God to this end. Of the earthly high priest it is said that he was "clothed with weakness" and therefore could judge with mildness the weak. In the picture of Christ are found corresponding qualities. That Christ "with strong crying and tears" prayed and "learned obedience" in his suffering, and probably also that he was afraid (if εὐλάβεια is to be translated "fear")—these are the badges which are to correspond with the human weakness of the earthly high priest. But if he delivered by his obedience "all them that obey," it is to be remembered that the earthly high priest offers sacrifices for himself *and* for the people. The question arises, Whence came the information about these events in the life of Jesus to the author of the Epistle to the Hebrews? He has not borrowed those details of the crying and weeping from our passion narrative, for his statements of strong crying and weeping go distinctly farther than the representation of the Gethsemane scene. Knowledge of the suffering of Jesus, however, assuredly did not come to the first Christians for the first time through the story of the passion in the gospels. For even before a passion narrative of Jesus had been written down the suffering of Jesus had been read in the Old Testament. But behind this use of Scripture stands more than scribal erudition; those Christians find in the Old Testament the justification of their faith that Jesus' suffering was willed by God. "Died according to the Scriptures" (1 Cor. 15:3)—that means for them, "died according to God's will in order to lead Christ to glory" (Luke 24:26).

Among the familiar Psalms out of which this was read, Psalm 31 (30 LXX) more than any other appears to come into consideration in this connection. For here in Psalm 31:22 are indicated precisely those surprising elements of the passage in Hebrews, even though in part in other words:[1] "I had said in my alarm (ἔκστασις which is obviously

[1] The reproduction of the Old Testament in the course of a narrative *must* not be done in the words of the text; on the contrary, if the event which corresponds to the text of the Old Testament is reproduced in other words the impression of actual fulfilment of the Old Testament is all the stronger. *E. g.*, it is to be observed: the flight of the disciples at the time of the passion is prophesied (Mark 14:27) in words from Zechariah. But the account of the event itself does not make use of the word of the prophecy "they shall be scattered," but says simply "And they all left him and fled" (Mark 14:50). The actual agreement is felt all the more.

εὐλάβεια, Heb. 5:7), I am cut off from before thine eyes: nevertheless thou heardest, O Lord, the voice of my supplication, when I cried unto thee." With these words another passage has perhaps been joined—in consequence of the associations which often occur in such citations—which could be well added to the former on account of the mention of prayer, supplication, granting of the request, viz., Psalm 39:13 (38:13 LXX): "Hear my prayer and my supplication, and pay heed to my tears." If we join these two passages, we have the most important material of the passage Hebrews 5 before us: δέησις, προσευχή. Hebrews has for this ἱκετηρία, κράζειν (Heb. κραυγή), ἔκστασις (Heb. εὐλάβεια) and above all εἰσήκουσας. This motif of "being hearkened to" has again and again been challenged in Hebrews on the grounds that it does not correspond to the actual event nor to the account of Gethsemane. If the Old Testament basis for the whole incident is seen, there can be no further ground for hesitation. Because this detail was sketched out beforehand in the Old Testament, it was introduced into the scene of the suffering and praying Jesus. This could be done without any historical misgivings since the outcome of the Gethsemane scene showed Jesus in a completely unbroken attitude; therefore he had been "heard out of his fear."

The conviction appears accordingly to have existed among the Christians even prior to the Epistle to the Hebrews, quite independent of the Gethsemane scene and based solely on the Old Testament, that Jesus had fought such a prayer through. And when this was read out of the Old Testament, these elements were also naturally proofs of his Messiahship. It was recognized that God had thus ordained, however disgraceful and unworthy for God's son such a scene might seem to human sensibilities. The Messiah must suffer even this in order to enter into his glory (cf. Luke 24:26). Thus Jesus' struggle in prayer was not something which was to be concealed or was to be but grudgingly admitted; it was *no disgrace,* but *proof of his Messiahship!*

Here we stop a moment longer and glance at the corresponding passage in the Fourth Gospel (John 12:27-30). Here we have most certainly genuine Johannine interpretation. Jesus says, "Now is my soul troubled; and what shall I say? Father, save me from this hour!" And this is explained in line with the Johannine Christology by the following words: "But (precisely) for this cause came I unto this hour. Father, glorify thy name." The analogy of Jesus' prayer at the grave of Lazarus (John 11:42) shows what is meant here: Jesus had experienced this deep emotion "for this cause," in order that he might direct this prayer to God and that God might answer this prayer with the voice out of

heaven which then resounds; and this voice out of heaven came, according to verse 30, "for your sakes." For John the prayer is therefore a demonstration of Jesus' union with God and the emotional outburst is simply the necessary prelude to the prayer. But precisely because John finds it necessary to interpret here, the scene does not seem to me to be simply his own conception; on the contrary, it has obviously not resulted without the utilization of tradition. John himself would have sketched it differently. The notion that once before the passion Jesus had suffered agony and from this agony had prayed can perhaps be accepted as such an element of tradition. This is accordingly essentially the same notion as that which underlies the statement of Hebrews 5:7ff.

Accordingly it appears to me to follow from Hebrews 5 and John 12 that the notion existed, quite independent of the Gethsemane scene and based upon the Old Testament view and thus adopted at any early time in the Christian groups, that Jesus had been overtaken by fright and fear and had prayed to God for rescue. And it may be asserted, however strange this appears to us, that for the earliest Christians, for those who still read their passion narrative directly from the Old Testament, all this—fright, fear, and prayer—belonged to the Messianic proof texts; that all this showed that these things had taken place in accordance with God's will. Thus even the description in Mark 14:33, 35 is to be read and understood as seeking to establish Jesus' Messianic mission, not merely to humanize it and thus to weaken it.

The second focus of the Gethsemane scene is in the warning word: "Watch and pray, that ye enter not into temptation." From this word it may be asserted that it is not spoken or conceived for this context. For if the temptation were meant which now, in the night of the passion, comes to the disciples, the warning simply to stay awake would be of no avail; even wide-awake disciples would be ensnared in this temptation. On the contrary, obviously the great eschatological temptation is meant, against which the warning word in 1 Cor. 10:13 is directed, since the latter alludes clearly enough to a more than human temptation. The call to watchfulness signifies what many New Testament passages seek to say with the same warning (cf. Mark 13:35; 1 Cor. 16:13; 1 Peter 5:8): the Lord is coming, but ye do not know when, therefore watch!

That this judgment is correct appears to be proved by the way the passage continues: "the spirit indeed is willing, but the flesh is weak." For actually in the case of the sleeping disciples who anticipate nothing, understand nothing, the spirit is by no means willing. Hence precisely in this sentence we discover that the meaning of the saying is not to be found in the Gethsemane situation, but in that of the groups of Christians

awaiting the Lord. The whole saying would fit admirably the condition of those churches to whom the letters in Revelation 2 and 3 are directed. But when it was brought into connection with the passion night, a dislocation of meaning resulted, for now the ones addressed must be represented as sleeping. The *slumbering disciples* thus provide the necessary *background* for the *warning admonition to watchfulness.*[2] Recognition of this entails, however, a consequence for exegesis as well. The one who referred the word about watching to the sleeping disciples—whoever he may have been—most assuredly did not see in the sleep anything supernatural, as a trance or the like. Natural human sleep was, he felt, the cause of that warning; as a contrast to the praying Lord the men, who anticipated nothing and therefore slept, were to be represented.

After we have come to recognize the elements of the tradition upon which the composition of the Gethsemane scene apparently depends, we can consider the shape which these elements have taken in the scene before us, probably at the hands of Mark. That such a process of shaping has taken place, that the scene accordingly was not created at one stroke is evidenced by two peculiarities in particular. In the first place, neither the second nor the third act of prayer has any substance. For the second of these only the repetition of the event is recounted, while for the third there is not even that. It is evident that the tradition of Jesus' prayer has been artificially divided into three acts. A second peculiarity is the prominence given to the three intimate friends of Jesus. The Gospel of Mark mentions these friends at the time of the raising of the twelve-year-old girl and of the transfiguration. In both of these cases the point at issue is a revelation of what Jesus actually is in accord with his heavenly origin. Correspondingly, in both cases Jesus allows only the most limited circle of his disciples to participate, and allows only them to receive the revelation of his true nature. To be sure, this revelation at the time of the transfiguration surpasses the powers of comprehension even of the three. In proof of this is the misunderstanding of Peter, who imagines he can remain longer in this place with the heavenly figures. "For he knew not what to answer; for they became sore afraid." But in the case of the Gethsemane scene there is no revelation to receive. Moreover these disciples would have been by no means in a position to receive a heavenly proclamation, for "their eyes were heavy." And even if here, as in the transfiguration story, it is said, "they knew not what to answer him," this does not signify, as in the case of the transfiguration,

[2] Cf. G. Bertram, *Die Leidensgeschichte Jesu und der Christuskult*, pp. 45, n. 5, following a hint from Adolf Deissmann.

the special dullness of human nature toward a heavenly revelation but simply the customary dullness of men overcome by sleep. Even this separation of the three disciples from the rest is accordingly the composition of the one who created the scene, and therefore not an element of the old tradition. The separation is simply dropped at the end of the scene—totally different from the case in the transfiguration (Mark 9:14; the return to the larger circle of disciples is not mentioned at all.

We can therefore see about how Mark created this scene out of the elements of tradition. As a setting for the lament and prayer of Jesus he has introduced the three intimate friends of Jesus and has then told about their sleep in order to provide a reason for the warning to watch. Then to the account of the lament and prayer in indirect discourse as he received it from tradition (Mark 14:33, 35) he added the direct discourse. In doing this he used, or at least echoed, biblical words. "Why art thou cast down, O my soul? And why art thou disquieted within me?" was to be read in the Psalms (Ps. 42:5, 11; 43:5 — LXX 41:6, 11; 42:5); and the grief "even unto death" was mentioned in Jonah 4:9. The choice of these biblical words furthermore proves that it is not a matter of Jesus' perplexity regarding his mission, for the man who utters biblical words in prayer knows himself in harmony with God. If in the word *Abba* as employed by Paul (Rom. 8:15; Gal. 4:6) there is an echo of an early Christian exclamation of prayer, and if in the concluding word to this prayer in Gethsemane there is perhaps an allusion to the content of the third petition of the Lord's Prayer, this points in the same direction: Jesus prays as the Christian is to pray. This rounding out of the scene has accordingly no Christological significance as does the underlying tradition of Jesus' prayer; rather it can be said that Jesus is portrayed here in the pattern of a martyr; even the symbol of the cup, already common in the martyr literature, is due to this.[3]

While Jesus is portrayed in Gethsemane in keeping with the picture of the martyrs, every trace of unworthy despair is expunged from him. To be sure, however, the real content of the scene is also changed. If the earliest community believed it knew Jesus' lament and prayer, it drew this knowledge from the Old Testament. That Jesus had prayed in agony "with crying and weeping" was, so to speak, the realization of an Old Testament ideal of suffering and consequently the fulfilment of a Messianic postulate (see above). Through the form given to the scene, as we read it in Mark, its content draws somewhat closer to the sphere of the human: Jesus is the martyr who has experienced human suffering on his

[3] I owe this hint to a still unpublished dissertation of my pupil Hans-Werner Surkau, *Jüdische und frühchristliche Martyrien*.

bitter road to death, but has vanquished it due to his submission to God's will. This martyr picture determined the form for the ecclesiastical ideas about Gethsemane.

Furthermore Mark created the second and third acts of praying, obviously without having any support for them in tradition. He has not given these repetitions any shape, but simply mentions them. He is concerned solely with the going and coming of Jesus. This he emphasizes in order to be able to provide as a contrast to the praying Jesus the sleeping disciples. We have already seen that the admonition "Watch" caused this, because it was referred to that particular instant and not to the last days. Accordingly it is not upon what Jesus says in repeating his prayer but upon what he says on his third return to the disciples that all the stress is laid. I have already emphasized the irony in these words. They lead into a fresh prophecy of Jesus' suffering—and like all predictions of suffering this one too is so formulated as to teach the reader to see and understand the passion: "The hour is come; behold, the Son of man is betrayed into the hands of sinners. Arise, let us be going: behold, he that betrayeth me is at hand." To give these words their full significance it is necessary to feel the contrast in meaning which lies in the word Son of man. There can be no doubt that this word means for Jesus' contemporaries the man who comes from heaven, the eschatological man who will appear on the clouds of heaven. The man from heaven falls into the hands of sinners —that is the superscription which is here given to the passion, and with this Christological conclusion Mark has brought the scene out of the realm of human martyrdom and has directed the thoughts of his readers once more to the real meaning of Jesus' suffering, namely to that which was to the Jews a stumbling-block and to the Gentiles foolishness, but which meant to the Christians the certainty of salvation: The one sent by God is by sinful man sent to the cross, and this happens in accord with God's will.

It may be that several such prophecies in different form have been placed in Jesus' mouth in different variants of the passion narrative. For these prophecies with their interpretation of suffering are what the Christians of the earliest period longed for. They will hardly have been advanced and quickened originally, as we still imagine, through pathetic descriptions of the bitter hours of the passion. On the contrary, they find their edification in the certainty that this suffering was a work of salvation, thus willed and appointed by God. And therefore in the oldest tradition there may have been more than one such saying—at once promise and explanation—in which Jesus himself proclaimed the right understanding of his passion. I mention this because I believe I have found such a

tradition in the Gospel of John and with this clue can perhaps solve an old exegetical riddle.

In this I assume that the Gospel of John contains very old elements of tradition in the passion narrative—some of which we know from the Synoptists; some of which we do not. I assume furthermore that the author of the Fourth Gospel has reworked these elements of tradition in his own way. They can therefore be only hypothetically reconstructed by subtracting the characteristic "Johannine" ideas. A proof of the Johannine method of revamping is provided by the way in which the evangelist in John 16:32 has disposed of the prophecy from Zechariah which we read in Mark 14:27. A further proof is provided by the revamping of the other prophecy which makes allusion to Peter's denial (John 13:38).

In John 14:30, 31 are found sentences in which Johannine and other elements are joined. I italicize the indubitable Johannine part: "*I will no more speak much with you,* for the prince of this world cometh. *But he hath no part in me; on the contrary (this comes to pass) that the world may know that I love the Father, and as the Father gave me commandment, even so I do.* Arise, let us go hence." If we excise the Johannine elements there remains: "the prince of the world cometh, arise, let us go hence." This is an exact parallel to the conclusion of our Gethsemane scene, except that the last author of wickedness, the devil, is spoken of instead of his tool, the betrayer. This, however, is a view of the passion which is by no means to be designated simply "Johannine." The same basing of an earthly event in the realm of the cosmo-eschatological occurs, for example, in Luke 22:53 where Jesus says to the officers, "but this is your hour, and the power of darkness." We may therefore assume that that word regarding the prince of this world with the invitation to depart had come down through tradition to the author of the Fourth Gospel. Then, however, the difficulty in the strange conclusion of the fourteenth chapter of John is at once cleared up. Here are precisely those words—"arise, let us go hence"—which appear to indicate the close of the discourse, and which consequently have given rise to all sorts of interpolation theories. If we may assume that they belong to a traditional word of Jesus which the author of the Fourth Gospel has revamped in this passage in his own way, every stumbling-block is removed. It is then no longer strange that in spite of the apparent conclusion the evangelist continues Jesus' farewell discourse. He has simply employed the traditional word to round off a train of thought, but has not intended by this to indicate the departure from table.

After the character of the old tradition has been examined, as well as the meaning of the account in Mark, the variations with which Matthew

and Luke have adorned the Gethsemane theme are to be considered. These in Matthew are comparatively few, in Luke numerous and important.

That both evangelists have cancelled Jesus' prayer in its indirect form is not surprising; actually it was superfluous when standing beside the text in direct discourse. To the same class of scribal variants belongs Matthew's concern to say more than did Mark about the second and third act of prayer; he gives the second prayer in direct discourse; the third, in contrast with Mark, is at least mentioned in his paraphrase. The phrase which expressed the lack of comprehension on the part of the disciples is at the same time cancelled. A slight alteration on the part of Matthew is more important. Where Mark tells of watching, he speaks (Matt. 26:38, 40) of watching "with me." In this a Christological thought gains expression. Here it is no longer a matter of preparation expressed in terms of watching but of followers consecrated to Jesus the Lord. That we understand the evangelist correctly on this point appears to me proven from Matthew 26:31; where Mark reads "ye shall be offended," Matthew has "ye shall be offended in me." In the Markan text the reference is to the eschatological offense, on which Christians in the last days come to ruin; in Matthew the reference is to a Christological offense, for Christ has taken the place of the coming eschatological kingdom.

The portrayal of the scene in Luke is radically different in its point of view. First of all we detect a greater concern for the historical circumstances, as is usually the case in Luke. The whole scene no longer appears an isolated section in the passion narrative. At the beginning of the account is a reference to the place to which Jesus had gone on this evening "as was his custom." This is according to Luke 22:39 the Mount of Olives. In this way the connection with the whole of the passion story is established. It is upon that custom according to 21:37 and 22:6 that the plan of the betrayer depends. In the course of this attempt to give an historical account the mention of a new name (Gethsemane) for the place is omitted. In the same way at the end of the scene Jesus' command to go hence is omitted; Judas is to come to precisely this place; Jesus must await him here.

Luke's treatment of the entire incident shows a strong curtailment and a corresponding enlargement.[4] The separation of the three intimate dis-

[4] I consider moreover verses 22:43, 44 a genuine part of the Lucan text in spite of the fact that there are not found in B. A. Ferrar group syr^{s}, etc. Lyder Brun has convincingly demonstrated in the *Zeitschrift für die neutestamentliche Wissenschaft*, 1933, pp. 265ff.: (1) that Luke can have written them; (2) that Luke never shortens the Marcan text in the passion narrative without compensation; (3) that the verses are exegetically significant. It appears to me that the whole Lucan account would be pointless without these verses (see my book, *From Tradition to Gospel*, p. 201f., note). The later excision is to be understood as a result of Christological misgivings.

ciples is gone; gone also is the going and coming of Jesus and the repeated disappointment at the sleepers. The behavior of the disciples is extenuated; they do not sleep for dullness, but "for sorrow" (Luke 22:45); the warning to watch has dropped completely out and the call to prayer is at the beginning as well as at the end of the whole scene, a warning which gains its real weight only through Jesus' example. For Jesus' model prayer now stands in the middle of the scene and completely fills it. The initial lament is gone; Jesus does not declare himself to the disciples. Alone in the presence of God he wages his battle, the battle of the martyr in the pangs of death. The sole heightening of the scene lies in this battle in prayer. This we fail to appreciate if we see in the appearance of the angel God's help which decides the contest. On the contrary, it is not until the angel appears that the battle becomes intense. The angel is to prepare the praying Jesus for this. And this stage of the battle is designated *ἀγωνία*; here we recognize the remnant of the old tradition of the death agony of Jesus. Only it is here concerned not with the fulfilment of a Messianic prophecy but with the portrayal of the particular torment of the martyr. The account of the sweat points this out clearest of all. This sweat was, it is said, "like drops of blood which fall upon the ground." There is no evidence for this in the Old Testament, for the passage which Justin Martyr (*Dialogue with Trypho* 103, 7 and 8) cites as evidence (Psalm 22:14), speaks only of the heart which melts like wax. The comparison with blood is, however, no mere metaphor; the statement is too explicit for that. Rather, something is plainly to be said which distinguishes this sweat of the one in prayer from ordinary sweat; therefore probably that it looked like blood. The appearance of blood instead of other fluids is a not unusual divine omen in antiquity.[5] Then the heightening of the whole is clear: a beginning, which in comparison with Mark has been toned down, without "fear" and without the "fall to the ground" (which perhaps came from Psalm 31:22 (30:23 LXX) *ἀπέρριμαι* and has here been softened down to "kneeling down"); an initial prayer, an increase of strength through the angel, which is comparable to the voice from heaven in the *Martyrdom of Polycarp* 9:1 —"Be strong Polycarp, and play the man!" Then follows the extreme distress: agony and bloody sweat are its details created by the pious feeling of the teller of the legend for the pious feeling of the reader of the legend. The victory of the martyr is not illustrated in a heavenly appearance, but in the attitude of Jesus at the time of the arrest. Thus Luke's account is intimately joined to the whole of passion; it is also,

[5] Cf. Luterbacher, *Der Prodigienglaube und Prodienstil der Römer* (Program of the Gymnasium at Burgdorf, Switzerland), 1904, pp. 23, 25 ("bloody dew," "bloody rain," and the like).

however—and it alone among the synoptic accounts—entirely determined by pious feeling.

When I speak here of legend, this is to imply a judgment solely of style and not yet of history. It is possible to give an historical judgment only after we have attempted to settle the meaning of the different accounts. It appears now that the whole scene is not due to the account of a witness nor even to the restricted observation of witnesses only partially awake.[6] Rather the scene is incorporated in the passion narrative because the community was clearly convinced of this agony of Jesus. And it had this conviction because such an agony and such a prayer belonged to passion motifs which had been taken from the Psalms in order to understand the suffering of Jesus.

The scene is therefore originally not prejudicious to the dignity of Jesus; it does not evidence a concession which a candid historian makes to truth, even if it does not correspond to his wishes. The Gethsemane scene is the deepest expression of the Messianic suffering which is accomplished for the salvation of the world. And therefore it emphasizes the contrast between Jesus and his sleeping disciples. It is not originally told from a feeling of human sympathy for the praying Jesus; a trace of this is introduced by Mark, but it is not till Luke that it is made a fundamental principle. This corresponds in general to the latter's view of the passion; hence no special source for Luke is to be assumed. Only in Luke does the story gain the style of the legend; in the Marcan version it still serves preponderantly the story of salvation (*Heilsgeschichte*). We must become accustomed not to introduce our human feelings into accounts which, in accord with the desire of the recounter, are solely for the purpose of evidencing the divine means of salvation. We restore to the story its original lustre only when we read it as it was first intended: not as an interesting and moving event, not as a page of history from the last hours of Jesus' life, but as the proclamation of the message that this suffering is in keeping with God's will, that is, in accordance with the proclamation of suffering in the Old Testament. Thus the method of "Form criticism," of which I have here given a sample, seeks to aid the old stories regain their old meaning.

[6] So Hans Lietzmann, *Zeitschrift für die neutestamentliche Wissenschaft*, 1931, pp. 212ff.

SHELLEY AND CHRISTIANITY

FREDERICK L. JONES

Professor of English, Mercer University

THOUGH Shelley's religious views have been explained many times, never, it seems to me, have they been explained simply and clearly in connection with their development in his mind. Especially has the significance of his *Refutation of Deism* (1814) and *Essay on Christianity* (1815) escaped observation. The failure of scholars to present these matters with sufficient brevity and clarity is due partly to their preoccupation with the poet's verse, whereas his prose works are in reality the repository of his views in their plainest and most direct form. We may begin such an exposition (which does not pretend to be complete) by stating certain fundamentals.

At no time in his life was Shelley an atheist.[1] He did unquestionably reject the God of Christianity as he thought that God was represented by the greater part of the Bible and by orthodox Christians and churches. He also rejected the divinity of Christ. But Shelley had a god of his own, a kind of "motion and a spirit, that impels All thinking things, all objects of all thought, And rolls through all things."[2] Shelley's essential conception of God never advanced beyond that stage, except to identify this spirit with all that is good and beautiful and true. Sometimes it is Intellectual Beauty, or Love, or both. These shadowy, though very real, concepts are everywhere observable, from *Queen Mab* to *The Triumph of Life*. They never get more clearly defined because they were never more definite for Shelley himself. Even Mrs. Shelley could not "pretend to supply the deficiency, nor [to] say what Shelley's views were—they were vague, certainly."[3]

Shelley's questioning of Christianity began at Eton, probably with his study of science. He was then not so much interested in proving the nonexistence of God as in posing the orthodox with unanswerable questions and unsolvable problems. He was enjoying the intellectual luxury experienced by nearly every student of a philosophic turn when the searching

[1] Those few instances in which Shelley declared himself an atheist are nothing more than emphatic defiances of religious bigotry. Trelawny asked Shelley: "Why do you call yourself an atheist? It annihilates you in this world." Shelley replied: "It is a word of abuse to stop discussion, a painted devil to frighten the foolish . . . I used it to express my abhorrence of superstition; I took up the word, as a knight took up a gauntlet, in defiance of injustice."—*Records of Shelley, Byron, and the Author*, 1887, p. 62. The famous "P. B. Shelley, atheist" in the Montanvert visitor's book was just "a painted devil to frighten the foolish."—Dowden: *Life of Shelley*, II, 30.

[2] Wordsworth: *Lines Written Above Tintern Abbey.*

[3] Preface to *Essays, Letters from Abroad*, etc.

rays of knowledge first reveal to him the complexity and uncertainty of those fundamentals which he has been taught to regard as simple, fixed, everlasting; namely, the pleasure of seeing his wise elders squirm when they are called upon to prove the truth of their precepts. At Oxford this intellectual sitmulus became a mental intoxication as Shelley threaded the mazes of the empirical philosophy of Locke and Hume, and found in it the logical instrument which would make his daring scepticism (apparently) unassailable. In corresponding with learned clergymen and in tearing their arguments to pieces, Shelley was having lots of fun. In fact, the whole of Shelley's stay at Oxford was a kind of intellectual debauch. His plunge into the sea of thought thrilled him, and he kicked and splashed in its waters with delight. Hogg's *Life* is ample proof of Shelley's exhilaration.

In writing *The Necessity of Atheism* Shelley was not attempting seriously to deny the existence of God; but, as Hogg says, he was digesting in a convenient form the essentials of the philosophy of Locke and Hume. The printed pamphlet was but a useful device for carrying forward his controversies with clergymen. Through all of this conflict with orthodox Christianity, however, there was unquestionably a very real element of seriousness. Shelley never engaged in any activity merely for sport. He was indeed searching for truth; he wanted to know what, if such existed, were the real grounds for a belief in God. He was himself not merely interested in discovering arguments against the existence of God, but in finding arguments for a God. From Field Place he wrote to Hogg, January 12, 1811:[4]

> I here take God (and a God exists) to witness, that I wish torments, which beggar the futile description of a fancied hell, would fall upon me; provided I could obtain thereby that happiness for *what* I love, which, I fear, can never be. The question is, What do I love? It is almost unnecessary to answer. Do I love the person, the embodied identity, if I may be allowed the expression? No! I love what is superior, what is excellent, or what I conceive to be so; and I wish, ardently wish, to be profoundly convinced of the existence of a Deity, that so superior a spirit might derive some degree of happiness from my feeble exertions; for love is heaven, and heaven is love. You think so, too, and you disbelieve not the existence of an eternal, omnipresent Spirit. . . Stay! I have an idea. I think I can prove the existence of a Deity—A First Cause. I will ask a materialist, how came this universe at first? He will answer, By chance. What chance? I will answer in the words of Spinoza . . . Was not this first cause a Deity? Now nothing remains but to prove that this Deity has a care, or rather that its only employment consists in regulating the present and future happiness of its creation. . . Oh, that this Deity were the soul of the universe, the spirit of universal, imperishable love! Indeed I believe it is.

[4] *Letters of Shelley*, ed. Ingpen, 1914, I, 41, 42.

This is very significant, for we find Shelley clinging to a belief in God when he can find no reliable support of reason for such a belief. Still more significant is the kind of God he is demanding thus early. This God of love was the only God Shelley ever acknowledged.

Shelley had begun his speculations with the vague notion that the world of knowledge was a world of freedom, that the explorer could go as far as he pleased and bring back the reports of whatever discoveries he had made, and that these would be received at least calmly if not enthusiastically by the judicious. He therefore pushed forward eagerly, for the world was all before him, where to choose. Gradually he discovered, however, that human beings, learned and ignorant alike, are fettered by prejudice and superstition. His first serious experience came during the Christmas vacation when he learned that his radical social and religious ideas had robbed him of Harriet Grove, his beloved cousin. At the same time the conflict with his father and family repelled and disgusted him. Shelley's agitation during the vacation is really quite alarming. His family saw only the stubbornness of a rebellious and wayward boy.

Shelley regarded his family and the Groves as victims of prejudice and intolerance. He returned to Oxford late in January, 1811, as to a place of intellectual liberty. Ere long his *Necessity of Atheism* was printed and distributed. The expulsion which followed was one of the great shocks of Shelley's life. Though Hogg's statements must be accepted cautiously, there can be no doubt whatsoever of their essential veracity in this matter. This was Shelley's second great jolt from direct contact with reality. The effects of the expulsion and of the events of the next year had a sobering effect. Gradually the boyish delight in startling his elders disappeared. And yet, though becoming more and more serious, Shelley did not relinquish one idea or one jot of his intellectual independence.

Sometime between his expulsion and his Irish campaign (probably while at Keswick[5]) Shelley, it seems to me, read Thomas Paine's works for the first time, especially *The Rights of Man* and *The Age of Reason.* These had a tremendous influence on him, an influence as yet without scholarly evaluation. *The Rights of Man* furnished political ideas which Shelley retained throughout his life, and particular ideas for the conduct of his Irish campaign. It is highly probable that the reading of this book even suggested the campaign to Shelley. *The Age of Reason* had just as great an influence on his religious thought. Its arguments met with Shelley's own experiences and inclinations in several important respects, and served as the chemical agent which fixed the dye of his thought. (1) Paine advocated absolute freedom of thought and religious toleration; (2)

[5] Nov., 1811—Jan., 1812.

he rejected any established form of religion and contemned priestcraft; (3) he rejected Christianity because the Bible is, he thought, demonstrably *not* the word of God, because it inculcates savagery and crime, and because Christianity has always been the source of unspeakable cruelty; (4) he deplored all attempts at retaliation and revenge; (5) he believed in a God, but a God of love, not a God of wrath and vengeance.

Shelley's experiences and mental development had prepared him to lay fast hold of these ideas. Some of them were probably new to him; namely, the complete rejection of the Bible, the degrading morality of the Old Testament, the crimes attributable to Christianity and to priests of every religion. Henceforth these were fixed ideas with Shelley.

Paine's analysis of the Scriptures sent Shelley back to a study of the Bible. He found something worth while in it, for shortly after his brief Irish campaign he prepared a volume of *Biblical Extracts* (1812) and wished (in vain) to have it published.[6]

After the composition of *Queen Mab,* Shelley's religious views rapidly reached their last stage of development. In *A Refutation of Deism*[7] (1814), it seems to me, Shelley has stated his final conclusions concerning God, atheism, and Christianity. This pamphlet, though heretofore regarded as insignificant, should be recognized as an important document in the history of Shelley's religious opinions. These are the conclusions which, indirectly, Shelley announces in this pamphlet: (1) that "natural or revealed religion" is the only possible kind of true religion; (2) that the reason, altogether inadequate in leading men to God and ultimate reality (or true religion), leads inevitably to atheism or to an acceptance of Christianity; (3) that he (Shelley) would rather accept any religion, however horrible, than atheism; (4) that, since there is no choice except between atheism and Christianity, he will endeavor to select from Christianity, and to believe, only that which is consistent with "my persuasion of the goodness, unity, and majesty of God."

Though Shelley was powerfully influenced by Paine's *Age of Reason,* he probably rejected Paine's Deism from the first, even with his first read-

[6] The *Extracts* were completed by December 17, 1812 (see note 7), on which day Shelley wrote Thos. Hookham that he was sending them "by the twopenny post."—*Letters of Shelley,* I, 373. Shelley's wish that Daniel I. Eaton should publish the *Extracts* is not without significance. In June, 1812, Shelley had written his *Letter to Lord Ellenborough* in defence of Eaton, who had been imprisoned for publishing Paine's *Age of Reason,* Part III.

[7] The *Refutation* was written after November 26, 1813, and published early in 1814. The idea which resulted later in the composition of the *Refutation* and the *Essay on Christianity*—as well as in the *Biblical Extracts,* with which they are connected—was already definitely in Shelley's mind by February 27, 1812, while he was in Ireland. On that date he wrote to Miss Hitchener: "I have met with some waverers between Christianity and Deism. I shall attempt to make them reject all the bad, and take all the good, of the Jewish books. I have often thought that the moral sayings of Jesus Christ might be very useful, if selected from the mystery and immorality which surrounds them; it is a little work I have in contemplation."—*Letters of Shelley,* I, 269.

ing of the book in 1811. His knowledge of Locke and Hume had already shown him the futility of the arguments for God used by the deists. For a long time, however, Shelley continued, in Paine's style, to exalt the reason and to attempt to find a solution for religious instincts through it. By the end of 1814 he had definitely concluded that the reason is incapable of conducting man to any possible god or religion. He therefore deposed reason, not because it can deny, but because it cannot affirm, God and the spiritual.

It can be safely asserted, I think, that Shelley never wrote any of his prose works (novels excepted [8]) with a purely negative purpose; that he always wished definitely to express his own views. If we take literally what, in his Preface, Shelley states to be "the object" of the *Refutation*,[9] we must believe that the pamphlet was negative in purpose, that Shelley was indulging in a clever logical combat without any active interest in setting forth his own views. Shelley had passed the stage of mere cleverness; and we can be sure that he would not trouble to show how Christians were injuring a Christianity in which he was not interested. The pamphlet itself clearly belies any such narrow interpretation of the Preface.

The *Refutation of Deism* is a dialogue between Eusebes, a Christian, and Theosophus, a deist. Theosophus states his reasons for rejecting the Bible, the Christian God, and Christian morality, which reasons are precisely those advanced by Paine in *The Age of Reason* and by Shelley in the notes to *Queen Mab*. Here, quite obviously, Shelley is expressing his own opinions. Theosophus then sets forth his reasons for believing in a God which nature and reason tell him must exist.[10] Whereupon Eusebes undertakes to prove to him purely by reason that Deism is untenable, that to be logical one must embrace atheism or Christianity. Theosophus promises to adopt Christianity if Eusebes can produce proof of such an alternative, for under no circumstances will he become an atheist. Shelley now clearly identifies himself with Eusebes and, with an astonishing amount of logical subtlety, succeeds in proving to his own satisfaction the necessity of one's adopting either atheism or Christianity. Theosophus concludes the dialogue by saying: [11]

[8] Nor are all of these (most of them are lost) to be excepted.

[9] Preface: "The object of the following Dialogue is to prove that the system of Deism is untenable. It is attempted to shew that there is no alternative between Atheism and Christianity; that the evidences of the Being of a God are to be deduced from no other principles than those of Divine Revelation.

"The Author endeavours to shew how much the cause of natural and revealed Religion has suffered from the mode of defence adopted by Theosophistical Christians. How far he will accomplish what he proposed to himself, in the composition of this Dialogue, the world will finally determine."

[10] These again are Paine's arguments.

[11] *Prose Works of Shelley*, ed. R. H. Shepherd, 1912. I, 330.

I am not prepared at present, I confess, to reply to your unexpected arguments. I assure you that no considerations, however specious, should seduce me to deny the existence of my Creator.

I am willing to promise that if, after mature deliberation, the arguments which you have advanced in favour of Atheism should appear incontrovertible, I will endeavor to adopt so much of the Christian scheme as is consistent with my persuasion of the goodness, unity, and majesty of God.

If Shelley had had any leaning towards atheism, he would have had Theosophus embrace atheism at once. That Theosophus was here speaking Shelley's own sentiments is proved by the *Essay on Christianity,* which Shelley wrote the very next year, 1815. In this *Essay* Shelley does precisely what Theosophus had promised to do: he endeavors "to adopt so much of the Christian scheme as is consistent with my persuasion of the goodness, unity, and majesty of God."

The *Essay on Christianity* is, with the exception of the *Defence of Poetry,* the noblest piece of prose Shelley ever wrote. In beauty of style, in depth of feeling, and in loftiness of tone it ranks with the best English prose. Moreover, it presents more completely and more clearly the source and system of Shelley's philosophy of love—the essence of his philosophy—than any other of his works in prose or verse.

Shelley's main purpose in the *Essay* is to extract from the New Testament what he considers to be the real teachings of Jesus Christ, than whom, though not divine, no purer, no greater person ever lived. The true philosophy and religion of Christ, he says, have been corrupted by the narrowness, ignorance, prejudices, and superstitions of those who wrote the New Testament accounts of his life and teachings. Shelley is convinced that [12]

. . . it is not difficult to distinguish the inventions by which these historians have filled up the interstices of tradition, or corrupted the simplicity of truth, from the real character of their rude amazement. They have left sufficiently clear indications of the genuine character of Jesus Christ to rescue it forever from the imputations cast upon it by their ignorance and fanaticism. We discover that he is the enemy of oppression and of falsehood; that he is the advocate of equal justice; that he is neither disposed to sanction bloodshed nor deceit, under whatsoever pretences their practice may be vindicated. We discover that he was a man of meek and majestic demeanour, calm in danger; of natural and simple thought and habits; beloved to adoration by his adherents; unmoved, solemn, and severe.

The essence of Christ's philosophy is love. Anything which has the slightest suggestion of threat, punishment, or vengeance can be regarded as spurious; it can in no way issue from Christ. When Christ said he had

[12] *Shelley's Literary and Philosophical Criticism,* ed. Shawcross, p. 102.

come to fulfil and not to destroy the old, Shelley credits him with a master stroke in diplomacy: by allaying the suspicion of radical changes, he gained the confidence of the people. But " having produced this favourable disposition of mind, Jesus Christ proceeds to qualify, and finally to abrogate, the system of the Jewish law." [13] He gave the Jews a new morality and a new God without their being aware of it.

Christ's conception of God is, of course, consistent with his central doctrine of love. This conception, completely adopted by Shelley, may be best represented by a few quotations: [14]

> . . . the ruling Power of the universe. He everywhere represents this Power as something mysteriously and illimitably pervading the frame of things [p. 88].
>
> We live and move and think; but we are not the creators of our own origin and existence. We are not the arbiters of every motion of our own complicated nature; we are not the masters of our own imaginations and moods of mental being. There is a Power by which we are surrounded, like the atmosphere in which some motionless lyre is suspended, which visits with its breath our silent chords at will [p. 90].
>
> God is represented by Jesus Christ as the Power from which, and through which, the streams of all that is excellent and delightful flow; the Power which models, as they pass, all the elements of this mixed universe to the purest and most perfect shape which it belongs to their nature to assume. . . This much is certain, that Jesus Christ represents God as the fountain of all goodness, the eternal enemy of pain and evil, the uniform and unchanging motive of the salutary operations of the material world [pp. 94, 95].
>
> Jesus Christ represented God as the principle of all good, the source of all happiness, the wise and benevolent Creator and Preserver of all living things. But the interpreters of his doctrines have confounded the good and the evil principle [p. 101].

The latter part of this unfinished *Essay* is on the " Equality of Mankind." Here Shelley applies the golden doctrines of Christ which he has just separated from the dross in the New Testament. This portion of the *Essay,* which contemplates the world and man regenerated through the operation of love, quivers with emotion; it is eloquent. Here we have in prose that vision of purified and perfected man which appears in so many of his poems. Shelley, of course, introduces his familiar political and social ideas, now impregnated with love and ordered definitely into a philosophic system of love.

Fearlessly Shelley had considered a world without God and a world with God. He had exercised the powers of reason in searching, under the guidance of philosophy, for what his heart insistently told him was the

[13] *Ibid.*, p. 105.
[14] *Ibid.*

ultimate source of truth. The reason failing, he plucked out the heart of Christ's philosophy and made it the heart of his own. Though still, according to the demands of orthodoxy, not a Christian, Shelley was in a finer sense a true follower of the Lamb of God, which taketh away the sin of the world.[15]

[15] I do not wish here to imply that Shelley had any convictions about sin; he speaks much of right and wrong, but appears to have no conception of sin in the Christian sense. In the *Essay* he wrote: "According to Jesus Christ, *and according to the indisputable facts in the case* [italics are mine], some evil spirit has dominion in this imperfect world. But there will come a time when the human mind shall be visited exclusively by the influences of the benignant Power [God]." This idea appears in the snake-eagle struggle of *The Revolt of Islam* and throughout *Prometheus Unbound*.

A BAPTIST STATE[1]

R. E. E. HARKNESS
Professor of History, Crozer Theological Seminary

In the many centuries of the Christian era the question of the relationship of Church and State has often been one of serious concern giving rise at times to persecution, armed conflict and warfare. Opinions have varied all the way between two great extremes. On the one hand there is the view that these two organizations of men have nothing whatever to do with one another. Their spheres lie quite apart. As is sometimes said, the Church is in the world but not of the world. Its message is eternal salvation, not politics or economic doctrine. On the other hand, it is held that these two constitute a unity of two divinely appointed powers coordinated for the purpose of direction, discipline and salvation of individuals and human society, though their respective authorities may not be clearly defined.

In controversies over this question of relative authority Popes, claiming the supremacy of the Church and their own august powers as vicars of God, have issued their bulls, hurled their anathemas and laid down their dreaded interdicts releasing the people from necessary allegiance to the temporal princes, and bringing mighty potentates to their knees in humble submission; but seldom for long. Emperors, knowing well the coercing potency of the sword and remembering the ancient, divine appointment of the ruler, have defied the fateful powers of the supernatural, challenged the superior claims of his Holiness, and violated the sacredness of his person at times by casting him into prison.

And similar conflicts are still being waged. Dictators, believing in the necessity of a totalitarian state if the desired benefits are to be gained for their people, have shorn the Church of its power, brought it into submission to the State and forced it to accept the will of the secular authorities in support of their policies.

Even where less tension prevails there may be no certain agreement as to their relationship. In fact in nations where the principle of the separation of Church and State is recognized differences of opinion, if not conflicts, still arise. The difficulty usually has its origin in the question as to the function and field of the Church's activity concerning which neither have Church and State come to mutual understanding nor have the leaders of the Church reached a unanimous conclusion.

[1] A paper read before the Baptist Ministers' Conference, Philadelphia, Pa.

In the days of primitive Christianity there seems to have been no such problem. The Church was a fellowship of the like-minded in Jesus. As citizens of the Roman Empire, whatever their supernatural hopes and aspirations, their spiritual beliefs and experiences, they were to obey the laws of the Empire and to engage in the ordinary affairs of life. When the tribute money was to be paid Jesus sent Peter to catch the fish in the mouth of which a coin would be found wherewith to pay their indebtedness.

It was the later persecutions which set the two apart. In that suffering the Christians were forced to the conclusion that the political State was a thing of this world, but the Church was of heaven. The State was part of the kingdom of darkness under the dominion of Satan, the Prince of the powers of evil. The Church was of the kingdom of light under the dominion of Jesus, Prince of the Powers of Righteousness. So between them there seemed to be an eternal conflict.

But Constantine by his toleration brought the two into harmony again. The Church became a ward of the State. Indeed it was the Church which invited the State to come to its aid and solve its theological and ecclesiastical problems. So the State provided and protected the organism within which the culture of the Church might extend and grow. In return for such material support on the part of the State the Church was to seek the spiritual aid and support of God's favor and blessing upon the State. Soon therefore these two authorities began to coalesce. The two orders, temporal and spiritual, operated side by side. Especially was this the case when after the collapse of the old empire, and the rise of the Roman Catholic Church, Charlemagne constructed a new Imperial power. It was a Holy Roman Empire, presumably the two Princes, Emperor and Pope, acting in concert. The State had the power of the law and of the sword. The Church had the power of the keys and of the spirit. It was the Church which inspired, counseled and blessed. It could raise or cast down, bind or loose, exalt to heaven or condemn to hell. Thus the Church and State were the two arms of the one body.

But Protestantism brought another change. Inasmuch as the Reformation was in large measure a political and economic revolution by which the developing new nations won their independence from the Empire, the Church within their respective territories became independent of the old Imperial Church, thus giving unity and strength to the new state order. In Protestant Germany, Lutheranism formed a German Catholic Church instead of the Roman Catholic whose political and religious dominance German nationalism had overthrown. Likewise in England, the Church was nationalized to effect through the years a determining force in creating

and maintaining unhestitating patriotic sentiment, the bond and the unity of national existence. Thus in the Protestant countries of Europe the church became the bulwark of the State, identified completely with the national policies and enterprises. Officially the organized Church was an integral, working division of the department of the State.

But as Nationalism developed into Democracy another change came to the religious order. The process had its origin in trade. As the rights of trade were gradually extended to all citizens with legal authority to manage their own affairs, they steadily demanded their freedom in political and religious matters. Slowly but surely, the prerogatives, as divine rights, passed from Kings and Princes to Parliaments and representative assemblies. As in corporations authority, that is the right of business management, was from within, so likewise civil authority was seen to rest with the people themselves; government was derived from the people and rested upon the consent of the governed.

In a similar way it came to be recognized that religion was from within, a matter of conscience, the authority for its exercise resting with the people themselves. As citizens by majority vote had the right to determine their business concerns, or decide the form and policies of their government, so they had the right to organize their own religious bodies and follow their own religious practices. In all these, in one as in the other, the will of man was supreme. So the Church was separate and distinct from the State, in each realm the people acting from their own free choice.

Such has been the position of the Baptists and the Ana-Baptists before them. They were, in fact, leaders in proclaiming that principle. Some of their early pronouncements may be quoted in order that the stand taken over three hundred years ago may be fresh in our memory. About 1612 John Smyth, the Se-Baptist, wrote:

> that the magistrate is not by virtue of his office to meddle with religion or matters of conscience, to force and compel men to this or that form of religion or doctrine, but to leave Christian religion free to every man's conscience and to handle only civil transgressions, for Christ only is the King and lawgiver of the church and conscience.[2]

A little later Thomas Helwys, Smyth's successor, presented a petition to James I to this effect:

> the king to judge righteous judgment herein, whether there be so unjust a thing, and of so great cruell tyranny, under the sunne, as to force men's conscience in their religion to God, is it not most equall that men should chuse their religion themselves, seeing they only must stand themselves before the judgment seat of God to answer for themselves?

[2] Scheffer, J. DeHoop. *History of the Free Churchmen*, p. 183.

And in 1620 we have a further assertion:

to grant men liberty in matters of religion, can be no prejudice to any commonwealth, neither does it deprive princes of any power given them of God.

It was the demand for these principles by Baptists, of whom many in their enthusiasm had become Quakers and Fifth Monarchy Men, that helped bring on the Civil War in England and gained temporary religious liberty during the Commonwealth. And it was the teaching of such men as John Milton, now proved to have been a Baptist, the sufferings of such preachers as John Bunyan, and the martyrdom of six Baptists who paid the death penalty in 1664, which finally helped to establish religious toleration in the British Constitution of 1689.

These doctrines were brought to America by Roger Williams in 1631 and were incorporated into his colony at Providence in 1636 and later into the charter of Rhode Island. There, from the beginning, freedom of conscience was recognized with absolute distinction between civil and religious authorities. Said this prophet of three hundred years ago in a threefold proposition: "First, that forced worship stinks in God's nostrils. Second, that it denies Christ Jesus yet to come, and makes the church yet national, figurative and ceremonial. Third, there is no other prudent, Christian way of preserving peace in the world, but by permission of differing consciences."

When the revolution began in the colonies it was the Baptists who insisted upon this separation. A delegation of New England Baptists led by Isaac Backus joined a similar group from Philadelphia to urge upon the First Continental Congress of October, 1774, the necessity of granting religious liberty. John Leland led the attack in the South. A general committee was appointed by the Baptists for the purpose of seeing to it that this principle should be adopted by the State of Virginia and should also be guaranteed by the new Federal Constitution. But even when this victory was won the committee did not disband until it was written into the law of the land in 1799 that all churches must find support in voluntary aid and not by state tax or enforced tithe.

Recounting these facts in the history of his own church,[3] Bishop Francis L. Hawks has written: "No dissenters in Virginia experienced for a time harsher treatment than did the Baptists." But in the struggle for religious freedom, "they revenged themselves for their sufferings, by the almost total ruin of the established church," for in the effort to achieve separation of Church and State they "were the principal promoters . . . and in truth aided more than any other denomination in its accomplishment."

[3] Hawks, Francis L., *Contributions to the Ecclesiastical History of the United States of America*, pp. 121 ff.

That story is familiar to all of us and I suppose needed not to have been repeated. As Baptists we are proud of it though other Christian bodies have also made their significant contribution. I have retold the story however, not that we might glow again in the pride of it but that we might consider the seriousness of it. If this traditional view of Baptist influence be historically correct then, I presume, it may well be said, in a certain sense, that a nation thus separating civil and ecclesiastical affairs is a Baptist State. Rhode Island was indeed originally known as such. That may heighten our self-esteem. We gladly take chief credit for such worthy achievement.

But are we as willing to assume responsibility for some things that have followed as a result of it? That is the serious question that should engage our attention today. If ours be the credit then ours also the blame for evils consequent upon it. Have all the results of separation of Church and State been unmixed blessings? Can we conscientiously say that it has been all free gain for the church and religion? Has the Church the actual freedom which it hoped to have and of which in America it has been inclined to boast through all these years?

I

Such a question, however, compels first of all consideration of a principle more primary than that of a free Church. It is that of free personality which involves the whole question of the sacredness and value of the human individual. As has been intimated the primary principle of Baptists has been personal liberty, rights of the individual guaranteed by law. We were pioneers in proclaiming the doctrine of human worth, the right of all men to economic, civil and religious freedom. But has not this guaranteed right of opportunity and achievement led straight at times to rugged individualism with certain evils contingent upon it? For, without condemning rugged individualism entirely, can it be denied that it has had its tragic evils? And is it not true that personal liberty has degenerated altogether too often into personal license? Has not this splendid doctrine of the divine right of individuals to enter the open doors of opportunities and enjoy the benefits of economic, as well as civil and political freedom, been construed as constituting a competitive race for individual monopoly of those opportunities and benefits? The doctrine of the right of achievement, the right to enjoy free opportunities has been so favorably received and so resolutely adopted that the morals of the methods of achievement and the ethics of the process have been entirely ignored. In fact " individual rights " in the sense of privileges to be possessed, benefits to be enjoyed, circumstances to be acquired, have been interpreted to mean

the divine right of unrestricted freedom in method of procedure, unrestrained latitude of practice in the process of attainment, and legalized license in the ruthless pursuit of the goal. The doctrine has become so corrupted and so twisted in its meaning as to deny its early, original purport and significance. By it a few individuals have asserted their "right" to monopolize the oil resources and products of the country, to own and control the ore deposits and the steel industry, to operate the public utilities, to dictate banking methods, manipulate the stock market, gamble in the food products of the people, crush out competition and determine wage standards, to build huge fortunes while multitudes starve and twenty million seek futilely for remunerative labor.

Such has been the interpretation of the Christian message and to practices in conformity with it the Church has either been silent or all too often has lent its approbation and blessing. The very fact that a generation ago the Christian forces of America could deal facetiously with the phrase "tainted money" is evidence of it. There was a principle involved and a dangerous tendency manifest which only clear-sighted social prophets could see and which we in this belated time are beginning to realize.

Consequently, the entire blame for this situation does not rest upon those who designedly or otherwise have misinterpreted this doctrine. The fact is the Church has been caught in the vicious paradox of its own Calvinistic theology. On one hand, the fundamental Calvinistic view of the absolute sovereignty of God reduced all men to a common level, upon which was developed a sense of equality and complete democracy. It created those fearless champions of personal liberty as the dearest possession of the human soul. On the other hand, it relieved man of all his responsibility for social conduct. Being dependent wholly upon God, man could not achieve anything for and of himself. It is God who accomplishes and achieves in the interest and on behalf of man. But as a matter of fact man did achieve—and marvelous things at that! Especially so in the new America. He conquered forests; established great businesses; built his mills; formed monopolies; created giant enterprises. Theologically, Calvinistically, it was God who had done so. Thus such leaders in the industrial and economic world express themselves as astonished at what God has done for them. They are amazed at his goodness toward them and confess themselves utterly unworthy of his favors. They are embarrassed by their riches and the wealth that pours in upon them, quite unable to understand the reason for this divine fortune that has befallen them. And in such professions they are profoundly and genuinely sincere.

Yet all the while they may have been absolutely ruthless, cruelly

heartless in their treatment of employees and competitors. For it is within the divine economy. God in his inscrutable wisdom has chosen this particular employer and industrialist to perform this task and to occupy this position, and if God is doing it, He is responsible and cannot be questioned. Society cannot call God to the bar of justice. What has been done is within the divine order and destiny, and according to the will of God.[4]

Some decades preceding the outbreak of the American Civil War a certain Baptist layman established a textile industry in Pennsylvania and became immensely wealthy, especially for that period. In his journal he tells us that he was startled by the success of his business, the rapid increase of his wealth and his abundant prosperity. He could never explain the reason for God's goodness to him and this most conspicuous manifestation of His favor. He was a profoundly religious man, of excellent character, deeply and generously interested in Christian education especially that of ministers and missionaries. But though the financial panic of 1837 and the bank failures of 1842 resulted in the constant mounting of the high cost of living, this Christian employer stedfastly refused to increase the wages of his employees above that originally paid at the founding of the business. And when his operatives struck for a living wage he brusquely and defiantly refused to negotiate with them, permitting them to return to their work only upon their agreement to accept the initial wage scale.

Such an attitude and practice have their generation in the religious conception of life's duty and relationship. In Calvinism the industrialist is the divinely chosen and appointed one.[5] He is relieved of responsibility toward society and conducts the affairs of his business according to the demands of efficiency. No obligations of ethical procedure rest upon him and his methods employed in the achievement of his successful enterprise may not be questioned.

Thus in America the successful man has been judged by what he does with his wealth, rather than by the methods by which he acquires it. How the rich man spends his fortune, this gift of God, this favor bestowed so

[4] "We must recognize this is a general principle, that riches come not at all to men through their own virtue, nor wisdom, not toil, but only by the blessing of God."

"Though some men seem to enrich themselves by vigilance, nevertheless it is God who blesses and cares for them. Though others are rich before they are born, and their fathers have acquired great possessions, nevertheless this is not by accident, but the providence of God rules over it." (Calvin, *Opera,* XXVI. 627, Sermon on Deut. 8: 14-20.)

[5] "The rights and interests of the laboring man will be protected and cared for by the Christian men to whom God has given control of the property rights of the country. Pray earnestly that right may triumph, always remembering that the Lord God Omnipotent still reigns." George F. Baer, president of the Philadelphia and Reading Coal and Iron Co., concerning the coal miners' strike, 1902. (Quoted from *The Robber Barons,* by Matthew Josephson, p. 374.)

freely upon him by the Almighty, is the criterion.[6] He is responsible for the expenditure of it. That is the basis for the estimate of his character, for, first of all, since God is responsible for all this, then his wealth is not his own, it belongs to God. He is indebted to Him for it and he must requite the Almighty therefor. At least he certainly must return one-tenth of it to Him. That is written in the divine law as revealed in Scripture. Thus the measure of a man's religious spirit, the estimate of his character, society's ethical basis of his acceptability is the measure of his generosity, benevolence and altruism whatever may have been his method of acquisition.

It is no marvel that after having been instrumental in causing a Wall Street panic which ruined thousands of people and disturbed the financial capitals of the world, a banker of international fame and power, asked for a word of explanation due to the public, hotly replied: "I owe the public nothing." Pious and faithful church-member though he was, he had never been taught such Christian ethics.

The fact is, the Church has been guilty of preaching an abbreviated gospel. It has demanded that the rights of individuals be secured but it has failed to recognize and declare the responsibilities that accompany the enjoyment of such rights. True to its historic faith and its heritage of fearlessness, the Church in a time of social injustice, unrighteous oppression and iniquitous class discrimination had championed this cause of the recognition of personal human worth and equality of opportunity without, however, being aware of its moral obligations.

None more than Jesus demanded the recognition and the assurance of the enjoyment of personal rights, but none more than he emphasized responsibilities related thereto. "Unto whomsoever much is given, of him shall much be required." And the Apostolic injunction is that the strong shall bear the burdens of the weak. *Noblesse oblige* rests at the very heart of Christian precept and profession. Society is justified in insisting that men of office, position, privilege or power, of whatever sort, shall be accountable to their fellows in the exercise thereof.

But if our teaching has contributed to the rise of a situation that is intolerable, shall we as Baptists not face the fact and seek a remedy? If a false construction has been placed upon the Gospel shall we not redefine it with the emphasis and insistence upon the original? The term "personal rights" should never be permitted to be interpreted as being synon-

[6] "Why then does God permit some to be poor here below, if not that He wants to give us an occasion to do good? So let us not attribute it at all to fortune when we see one rich and another poor, but let us recognize that God so disposes, and it is not without reason. We cannot always see why God enriches one and leaves another in poverty. . . Therefore God wants us often to lower our eyes to do Him honor, since He governs man according to His will and inscrutable wisdom." (Calvin, *Opera*, XXVII. 337, Sermon on Deut. 15: 11-15.)

ymous with "privileged individualism," "irresponsible methods and management" or "predatory monopoly." It means the condemnation of "privilege" in any form whether it be claimed by "divine right," inheritance, force of arms, shrewd manipulation of economic forces or by advantage taken of technicalities of the law. The only privilege any man possesses is the rightful opportunity to earn a livelihood by the expenditure of his own labor and enjoy a competency for himself and his dependents. Never should charity, benevolence and philanthrophy, no matter how noble and generous, ever be allowed to condone the ruthless and soulless methods of acquisition. Never again should society be able to enjoy highways, public parks and glorious gardens built and established by profits "earned" in the shambles, the mud and the blood of Chateau-Thierry and the Argonne, or in the fratricidal clashes of South American Republics. Christian theology should never again be able to consecrate hospitals and colonial villages, beneficial to humanity as they may be, which have been erected out of billions "earned" not by the genius of one man but by the thousands driven as machines to be thrown on the rust-pile at the age of forty. There is an intellectual and spiritual incompatibility in the enjoyment of public libraries, Christian colleges and Church organs endowed by funds wrung from the ruined business of helpless competitors and the starvation wages of striking employees forced into subjection by the bayonets of private militia. No longer can Christian people lend their approbation and glorification to the erection of institutions of higher education and the support of missions out of endowments squeezed from the livelihood of millions by monopolistic control of natural resources. Today enlightened Christian ethics demands an accounting not only of the expenditure of fortunes but also of the amassing of them.

In fact we have come to see that the teaching of Christianity is not so much the insistence upon obtaining and enjoying rights as it is upon the sharing of values—the creation and enjoyment of opportunities, privileges and mutual benefits. The challenge of Jesus was to seek first the kingdom of God, the creation of a new social order in which the search for human welfare was held supreme.

That does not restrict individual effort nor restrain creative ability. It appeals to the imagination, flings wide the range of vision, challenges the highest endeavor, tests the ingenuity of brilliant minds, sets a task worthy the grappling of the most active, restless, creative genius "with empires in his brains." To force the earth to yield its tremendous unmeasured resources, to transform these raw materials into products of service, to organize and develop means for their general distribution so as to make them contribute most largely to human welfare without pamper-

ing and pauperizing people thereby—that, not to speak of many another need of cooperative effort, is an enterprise worthy the most creative and executive ability of any man.

Those of modern times who have contributed the most permanent and lasting gifts to mankind have not been these leaders of industry who, demanding their rights, first of all enriched themselves before sharing their surplus wealth, but those who counted not the cost of their service. Pasteur in his pathological research discovering the bacterial origin of diseases and vaccines for their prevention; Noguchi who in 1918 by experiments upon his own body discovered the germ causing yellow fever and by developing preventive vaccines and a serum, practically wiped out the disease in the Western Hemisphere and who on the same mission in Africa died in 1928 a willing sacrifice that the scourge might not spread to the crowded millions of the Orient; Grenfell who almost single-handed has created a new civilization in Labrador; Schweitzer, brilliant and cultured, who spends himself in service of the natives of equatorial Africa; these are the men who by enriching others regardless of themselves have proved that a new world order can be established in which dwells righteousness, peace and good-will. These, and thousands of others, have obeyed the command of the fully rounded gospel and have proved the sanity of the teaching of Jesus.

II

Let us proceed to the corollary of this principle of the right of the individual—the separation of Church and State. What has been the fact? A compromise! The State has declared that because of the favor of freedom from civil interference granted to it, the Church must accord a similar freedom to the State. Not only has the Church no right of dictation, nor authoritative power over the State, but it has no right to evaluate its policies, nor pass judgment upon its decisions nor criticize its conduct of affairs. For the State has interpreted its separation from the Church as a constitutional denial of the right of the Church or churches to voice any opinion whatsoever on political matters.

But just here comes the rub. The professed function of the State is to provide for the care, protection, well-being of its citizens. But this is also the function of the Church—not alone in temporal needs, but also in spiritual. And often it has been found by both organizations that these conceived functions have been in conflict. What have been the consequences in general? The State has agreed that the Church is free to exercise its function but it has delegated to itself the right to define that function. And the Church, in the logic of its position has altogether too

often submitted to that definition. So then separation of Church and State has not always been synonymous with freedom of the Church. Quite otherwise at times, the refusal to permit the Church to speak its mind on state policies has been as authoritative, restrictive and enslaving of conscience as in the days of old. When the Church or a minister has dared to express opinions on these matters, more than once they have been boldly told that they have trespassed upon foreign territory and have been ordered to retreat beyond the confines of their own legitimate field.

Christianity teaches above all else racial good-will, neighborliness among the nations. But should a minister preach upon internationalism in what he believes is the spirit of Jesus someone is sure to call him an enemy within the gates, unconstitutional according to the first amendment. Should a preacher and the Church put themselves on record as being opposed to war, the entire United States Army and Navy arises to denounce them as both heretics and traitors, guilty of unconstitutional practices, fit subjects for Leavenworth by virtue of their disregard of this sacred and holy principle of separation of Church and State. The United States fleet gathers in magnificent display beyond New York harbor, visited by the President of the nation. The great ships pass in battle array from West to East and East to West through the Panama Canal. The Pacific Squadron is to enter into maneuvers in the vicinity of the Aleutian Islands —not far distant from Japan. Why?

Again, as Doctor Schweitzer says: " In some cities now air-raid practices are held, with sirens shrieking and all lights out. People shove something over their heads which makes them look like beasts, and rush into cellars, while flying through the air appears the superman, possessing endless power for destruction." [7] This, says the State, is our means of protecting our citizens. This is our way of providing for their well-being. To such extent in expense, in ever-solicitous concern for the benefit of our people, do we go. And it's the only way. Peace by preparedness. Threat poised against threat. Suspicion met by suspicion. Aggression to defeat aggression. Ugliness for ugliness.

And any suggestion of other measures by the Church is denounced and pronounced " yellow," " pacifism," innocence, lacking in hard common sense and the knowledge of this world and human nature. And any protest by a minister or church is condemned as presumption, a usurpation of another's authority and function.

That this is not the mere generalization of prejudice, the following may prove. *The Christian Century* of December 19, 1934, quotes from an editorial in *The Chicago Tribune,* December 11, 1934, these words:

[7] Quoted from *The Christian Century,* November 28, 1934, p. 1520.

The church-member whose affiliation is based on religious needs and convictions and finds that his pastor, acting formally or by natural implication as representative of his Church, is pronouncing upon economic or political measures and policies contrary to his own beliefs and even his own material interests must either leave his Church or submit to the use of his influence against his own interests as he conceives them and against his convictions. . . If this tendency proceeds we shall have control of the State by the Church, or the State on behalf of its own independence will have to control the Church. Neither alternative would be conducive to the peace and welfare of the people or of either Church or State.

But in the days of the Great World War the Churches were called in to the aid of the nation, and the voice of the Church in support of the war and the national policy was welcomed if not required.[8] Anything less than enthusiastic participation from pulpit and practical salesmanship of Liberty Loans was branded as yellow, "Every office of the government with a war message to deliver appealed to the ministers first of all." But now the Church must be speechless, at least it must offer no suggestions as to policies of war and peace. In times of war the councils of the Church are sought. In peace it is gagged. But if in times of peace the government refuses to heed the warning of the Church that its policy of militarism, instead of preventing war leads inevitably to it, then when war comes how can the State punish the conscientious objectors? Truly the editor of *The Christian Century* has declared that the greatest enemy the Church in America, if not in the world, must fight is nationalism.

III

Here it must be admitted that the Church has often agreed to this limitation and submitted to the dictation of the State. In the days of slavery in this country many ministers, and among them Baptists, said that slavery was guaranteed by the Constitution and therefore the Church could do nothing about it.

How often has it been said by preachers that the minister as preacher has nothing to do with politics, that his sermons should not deal with questions of economics, nor even with problems of evil and suffering created by the traditional practices of business? And the so-called social gospel has met with severest criticism and denunciation as being heresy, alien to the great commission. Religion is this inner personal experience of regeneration, the power of God in the heart. Ministers are to preach Christ and him crucified.

And it has been added that if a man is truly converted, if the law of God be written on his heart, if and when he accepts Christ as Saviour, he will go out into society living a good life. Thus is the kingdom of God

[8] Abrams, R. H. *Preachers Present Arms.* Especially Chap. IV.

to be brought in; each new-born man, each new creature in Christ, is an addition to the membership of that kingdom and its number is thereby increased. Moreover, his influence for good-will spread throughout his community and the social order and thus the spirit of good-will extends and permeates society as the leaven spreads throughout the meal.

I would answer these sincere beliefs, first, in this way: Man is a social being. There is no such thing as an individual human being in and of himself. He is a social creature. No man liveth unto himself alone. He lives by, with, and in fellowship with others. He must take part, for instance, in the political order of his day and group and he must submit himself thereto. So likewise he is an economic being; he must find food, clothing, shelter, and provide education, culture, recreation for his family, and he must do so according to the methods of his time and group. He is bound up inescapably with this bundle of life, sharing in its faults and failures, its mistakes and sins, its values and its blessings. So, just because this human being, this son of God if you will, is a creature of this total social order, the Church cannot be indifferent to that social order. He is part and parcel of it, an operator of it, a profiteer by it, or perhaps an involuntary, helpless victim of it. That system makes him what he is, and Christianity cannot neglect it.

Nor is it sufficient to convert a man. History has abundant proof of that. Such a man may be good according to his light, but he may need greater light. He may genuinely wish to do the will of God, but the provoking, disturbing question ever is, "What is the will of God?" It may be interpreted at times, and has been, in terms of the most inhuman conduct, antisocial action, or at least indifferent social concern. John Calvin, as many another profoundly Christian man, could send his fellows to the stake, or to rot in dungeons or to be torn upon the rack of the Inquisition. Sir John Bowring, author of such beautiful hymns as "God Is Love, His Mercy Brightens"; "Watchman, Tell Us of the Night," and "In the Cross of Christ I Glory" could engage in the slave trade.

No, a man desiring to be good does not always know how to be good nor what the good is. A conscientious man needs to have his conscience enlightened. A great function of the Church, and a neglected function, is to teach. If we wish scriptural authority for it, the Great Commission is to teach as well as preach, and Paul not only urges his workers to evangelize, but also to teach.

Nor must we forget that the field is the world—not alone geographically but industrially, politically, educationally, morally. Christianity deals with systems of thought, human situations, social orders, spheres of industry, domains of politics. We must claim the whole world and noth-

ing less. We know perfectly well if men are not Christian in all these spheres and relationships, they are not Christian at all. Perhaps most laymen would admit this readily without, however, seeing the logic of it. For they think of themselves as being Christians because of their beliefs, the doctrines they accept, or because of certain rites which they observe. That in their minds constitutes discipleship. They must be taught that discipleship involves their attitudes toward all others, their reactions toward the total order of their experiences, their conduct under all circumstances, their motives, endeavors and achievements in all interests and activities. Discipleship is the spirit and mind of Jesus adopted, adapted, interpreted, practiced in this present-day order of life—that is the total world of man's being.

And the Church dare not neglect any part of it. Not that it is to enter into the realm of politics, certainly not into party politics—nor public education nor industry. Nor is it to ally itself definitely with any and every system or scheme that looks toward social amelioration or reform. It must keep itself free from all such entanglements, that it be not under obligation to any individual or any group of individuals, free always to search out the highest good of men.

For the interest and mission of the Church is to seek human welfare, to endeavor to establish here on earth that social order in which personality is held supreme in which all men everywhere have the opportunity of enjoying life's best privileges. Its chief concern is the proclamation of that ideal, the resolute insistence that all things else must be subject to human well-being. It is its duty to place its finger upon any evil which deprives man of that good and hinders him from attaining his own high privileges. It is its task to denounce with passionate invective any man or group of men, or any system that has placed personal gain or any other value above the value of human worth, and to demand with the same righteous zeal that all such evils shall be done away.

The Church may not know how that evil can be destroyed; it may not know or possess the technique by which these wasting, destroying corrupting forces of society may be reformed and transformed; it may not know how the good may be won and the more wholesome social order established. But it must inspire men to that task, insisting that men *shall* find the way, by all the means at their disposal—education, medical science, social science, physical science, legislation—in the consuming faith that what man seeks to accomplish he can accomplish, and that man must have a society in which he may enjoy a richer life than yet has been his. And the Church itself must be willing, if necessary, to make its own adjustments—

to give up its own cherished beliefs, its own traditional methods, its own established forms—in order that that great goal may be attained.

I am less concerned about people's indifference to the Church and to Sunday observance than I am about the Church's conception and attitude toward its own task. Great is the Church's opportunity and great therefore its responsibility. The churches were full a generation ago and we bemoan their emptiness today. But this we know, many folks went to church formerly because they had nowhere else to go, it was their only social and emotional outlet. But many people still go to church. That they do so is a good sign. They go out of choice, at once creating the Church's privilege and obligation. What are we going to do with them and for them, these eager people seeking the true way of life, the solution of pressing problems and comfort in their distress?

They are in politics and they suffer perhaps therefrom. They pay taxes to find them often corruptly spent. They vote from honest motive to discover campaign pledges broken. They support missions and other world-wide causes in the hope of world peace, only to see their representative governments carry out national policies that lead inevitably to war in which their children are cannon-fodder. They are in industry and business, they sell their strength in labor, they seek to save for an independent old age or the noble benefits of their children only to have those hard-won savings wasted by those whom they trusted, and their own bodily strength and trained experience cast aside. Eager to labor, they cannot earn. If the Church asserts it has no message for these, no help to offer, no concern for their sufferings, no proposal for remedies, then indeed has it failed. What would have been our situation had not Roger Williams been willing to suffer exile for conscience sake? If Obadiah Holmes had not been whipped upon the bare back so that he could neither lie down nor stand erect. If Isaac Backus had not dared the wrath of the established order in making his appeal for a free church before the dignitaries of the First Continental Congress. If John Leland had not become a member of the Virginia Assembly while still pastor of his Church; and if James Ireland and John Waller had not suffered imprisonment in the Old Dominion that religious liberty might be written into its Bill of Rights and the Federal Constitution. They, demanding separation of Church and State, nevertheless believed that religion encompassed all of life and they sought to make it dominant in the affairs of men. Somehow the Church must recapture that position and that power in all the realms of human activity.

A Baptist State—much rather, a Christian State—is not merely that from which the Church is organically, institutionally, officially separated,

but is one in which the Church is free to perform her function as she herself conceives it; free in pulpit, class-room and council chamber; free to champion the cause of human beings everywhere; free to condemn every evil force that for any purpose whatever would encumber, debase, degrade, profiteer upon human life. It is that social order in which the Church stands above the State, superior to it, daring to dictate to it; to dictate not methods but motives, not programs but purposes, not measures but ideals; aloof, disinterested in order to judge, counsel, inspire, direct, lead. It is that power in society, and that power alone, which can and must claim the right to "convict the world convincing men"—even men in high places —"of sin, of righteousness and of judgment." It is that power which can and must bring comfort to the sorrowing, healing to the wounded, courage to the faint-hearted, strength to the weak—not by lovely words, but by deeds, by the creation of a new world in which dwelleth righteousness.

RELIGION AND NATIONALISM

ORVILLE A. PETTY, Ph. D.

Our tacit assumptions are usually more significant than what we affirm or deny. Our first step is to set the problem as clearly, concisely, and completely as possible. Our second step is to comment as to our consistent and continuous response in attitude and action.

First, then, let us see if we can find out just what our problem is—not assuming finality but seeking validity. At the beginning of any earnest, truth-seeking study, we should be mutually clear as to the meaning of terms used. Sometimes we use the same terms to mean different things and anon different terms to mean the same thing. There are various types and groups of organized religion around the world—indeed, in our own country. Even groups of Christians cannot agree as to what is essential Christianity and disagree intolerantly. What is called "the church invisible" is unavoidably inarticulate. There are many types and degrees of nationalism around the world; some of these are worthy in part or whole, while others are wholly unworthy of our day. What we are trying to say is this: in setting the problem *we must swing clear of both sectarianism and provincialism.* That is to say, what we propose in attitude and action should be *true and good for any religious or civil group, at any time, any place in the world.* The life of the peoples of the world is more and more intertwined and interdependent.

When we speak of "the church" all too many of us assume that the term means *my* brand of religion as to orthodoxy, ritual, polity, or else it isn't *the* church in any valid sense. When we speak of "the state" (in America, "the government") we often fail to include ourselves as responsible citizens: the government is viewed as a pagan outsider or absentee landlord, and certainly wrong if not of our party or religious persuasion. Americans are prone to be sectarian and provincial. We are not conspicuous for our breadth or judicial-mindedness. If our President happens to belong to our political party or ecclesiastical group, it isn't quite so bad. If across the world, where missionaries work, the rulers are not orthodox Christians, it is too often assumed that they are not fair and certainly cannot be divinely led. It is suggested that in this discussion the term "religion" stand for the "eternal purpose in the soul of man and his response thereto." It would be well also to remember that separation of *organized* religion and civil government, does not imply or involve the separation of *religion* from "the state." To assume that *my* church, *my* religious group or *my* sect is certainly right as against the civil govern-

ment under which all religious groups live is simply ballyhoo. Perhaps antiecclesiastical, or even antireligious, governmental action is most often *reaction* to the heritage of unjust ecclesiastical denomination. In the earliest bit of church history extant, Peter is reported to have said to a Roman officer, "I see quite plainly that God has no favorites, but that he who reverences him and lives a good life in any nation is acceptable to him" (Acts 10:35). It is fallacious to assume that the Pharisees and Sadducees of established ecclesiastical orders are more selfless and just than governmental leaders. Leaders in government have frequently been more sane and more just interpreters of God's purpose than the leaders of organized religion.

The word "nationalism" is given a sinister accent on the lips of many: it is so pronounced as to sound like a synonym for selfish provincialism. Among thoughtful people, however, the essential unit of international justice cannot be scorned into oblivion by making the word "nationalism" an epithet. A discussion leader should not presume to settle the question as to what is the most worthy and effective unit of government for the peoples of the world. But some of us are convinced that no *one* type of government, much less *one* government, whatever it may be, is worthy or just for all. It is quite likely that Aristotle was right when he maintained that what type of government was best for any people depends on their stage of development, that is, on the character, ideals, culture, self-command and cooperation of the citizens concerned. Those who read history thoughtfully will not become jittery over the so-called "rising tide of nationalism." The old aggressive nationalism of the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries and that of Rome in the days of the Cæsars were worse than the worst nationalism today. Smaller nations have a better chance to achieve liberty and maintain their integrity than ever before. Well-qualified nationalism cannot be erased without leveling down some of the essential values of the more advanced nations. Nationalism must be kept, chastened where aggressive, and integrated toward international justice—each nation wanting only its share and fully doing its share. Nations as units of leadership and progress are essential to the full self-expression and self-realization of diversified peoples and to assure the development of a wholesome international order.

> A man of "universal" mood
> Began the day in need of food;
> Peach, pear or plum his taste could suit,
> He wanted *widely* "only fruit."

When nationalism becomes greedily and aggressively ambitious it is a menace: America is not blameless; indeed Americans are more selfish at

heart than many other peoples. Nationalism, however, is inherently group self-respect. Now, self-respect involves a sense of worth and service—a *noblesse oblige*. Courtesy is sympathy for the self-respect of others. Combine national self-respect and national sympathy for self-respect and all will be well. There is a subtle phrase "the system," which is central in a *system* of fallacious propaganda today. "The system" is blamed for everything. We must, these promoters of *another* system say, do away with representative democracy, private property and organized religion, and then we shall have peace, justice and reality. In response to a question, a Sunday school pupil suggested that the first thing a missionary should do when he landed on a cannibal island would be to "teach the cannibals to be vegetarians": perhaps resistance unto self-preservation and a few lessons about choice of meats would be more satisfactory and effective.

Let us consider for a few moments the phrase "organized religion," or to be more exact, "organized groups of believers," since they are legion. Our problem is not properly set unless we recognize that there are many and various religions and religious groups in almost every State. That is, under whatever government around the world various religions and sects obtain. In some countries Protestants predominate; in others Roman Catholics outnumber all others; in many Oriental countries Christians of all sects are wee minorities. Our procedure should cover all cases with equal courtesy and justice. In other words our problem is not primarily one of *our* church, our sect or of a more inclusive religious group, clashing with civil government, but one of the liberty and integrity of socialized, clear-eyed, high-minded individuals as against intolerance whether ecclesiastical or civil. Either organized religious groups or governments may command where we cannot comply and keep our souls. Neither our Church nor our State is always right. As individuals we must be true to ourselves at all hazards and at all costs. On the other hand neither religious nor civil organizations can maintain their own integrity if they impinge on the integrity of constituents. Both anarchy on the part of individuals and despotism on the part of governments can be avoided, *if* individuals are social-minded and the governmental group is tolerantly and inclusively true to itself. Integrity excludes both antisocial egotism and intolerant domination. It is a fatal error, however, to assume that, by and large and through the centuries, organized religion has been, is, or will be, right whenever the civil government has been, is, or will be, directing differently.

As Christians we are interested in the example of Jesus who started a movement which became what we call "Christianity," and which organ-

ized itself later into churches of many varieties, even in New Testament times. He never attacked his government (foreign domination) by word or deed, in spite of urging by ardent disciples. But he castigated the established ecclesiastical order and its leaders with a tongue of fire! He wrote no creed, prescribed no ritual, outlined no polity, belonged to no denomination, and authorized none of these; nor did he favor any one type of civil government above another. It is as plain to some of us as the noonday sun in a cloudless sky, that Jesus stood for the freedom and integrity of individuals against ecclesiastical assumptions and domination. It may be reasonably inferred also from his record that this "strong Son of God" did not believe in the separation of religion and government. Furthermore, it is evident that Jesus believed in essential theocracy, not mediated by *priests or other ecclesiastics,* but as obtaining through God-fearing, prophetic-minded leaders, whatever the type of government. Jesus' ideal was the Kingdom, or Reign of God, not an established ecclesiastical order. "Thy kingdom come" was his objective: a world-order—just, peaceable, cooperative, righteous, under any and many types of government. There is no evidence that Jesus favored any one type of government as a prerequisite in achieving his ideal of the Reign of God. We may infer also that he regarded ecclesiasticism as an obstacle to be removed: he gave his life to this task.

Only in a secondary sense are the mutually exclusive areas of the functions of organized religion and civil government involved in our problem. As a matter of common-sense logic and socio-religious consistency both organized religion and government should agree to cooperate on every level of human well-being. Government is untrue to itself if it violates the integrity of individuals in their approach to God. Civil governments are under obligations, however, to proscribe antimoral or antisocial rites such as suttee, religious prostitution, child marriage and the like. Governments should favor no religious group and should be controlled by none. In a free state, approach to God as individuals or as groups is inviolate. In a state which will not tolerate such approach it is the duty of individuals to maintain their integrity without whimper, whine or sigh. In all other areas of life or experience than approach to God, government has priority over organized groups of religious devotees: but in neither "churches" nor "states" should authority be exercised in such ways as to violate the integrity of socialized individuals. It is one of the essentials of good government to shelter the integrity of individuals and to protect minorities against injustice. The bigot, the vagabond, the

social slacker, the criminal and the self-careful citizen violate their own integrity.

As we recall history we will probably concede that organized religion has violated the integrity of selfhood more intensively and more extensively than civil government. Indeed the worse excesses of governments have often been instigated and effectively abetted by the leaders of organized religious groups. "The church" has often been less Christian when tested by the attitude and action of the Galilean Prophet than "the state" has been. The churches, or voluntary organized religious groups, cannot consistently claim to be more reliable interpreters of the purpose of God than governments are. Many of us would prefer a Cæsar to a Hildebrand, a Calles to a Rasputin. Priestism in all religions has usually represented the worst types of despotism.

The crux of our problem is not a dilemma as to the mutual and exclusive functions of religious organizations and civil government. Our problem is properly set when we recognize that the integrity of socialized individuals must be assured for all citizens as against ecclesiastical control (regardless of religious affiliation, or none) by tolerant governments which maintain their own integrity by working no injury to the integrity of fearless, unselfish, socially minded citizens.

Having tried to set the problem, a few suggestions may be added concerning *our consistent and continuous response.*

A world-known leader has said that if all economists and sociologists —one might add, all ecclesiastics also—were laid end to end across the world they would not reach a conclusion. Yet it may not be too bold to suggest a few principles in the light of the discussion so far, on which many of us, as among those engaged in open-minded quest, may agree.

1. We must train and encourage individuals to find and to keep their souls. That is, to attain and maintain the integrity of oriented selfhood against any encroachment by intolerant "churches" or "states."

2. We must avoid bigoted or sentimental egotism in our decisions and loyalties by respect for the sincere and intelligent judgment, and the good, of others, when trying to appreciate our responsibility. Group loyalty has its claim as a star *witness* in our judgment as to social values involved: this will prevent both anarchy and despotism.

3. We must exercise the "right of petition" to either the civil or the religious organization involved. Organized religious groups, Christian or what-not, are voluntary organizations within states, and as such have the same privileges as Chambers of Commerce and Labor Unions to proclaim their ideals, present petitions and file protests, if injustice, or the personal integrity of any, is deemed to be involved.

4. We must express our well-considered protests as individuals, singly or as groups, whatever the cost to ourselves, that does not involve our integrity.

5. We must not only take our stand, loyal to our own selfhood, but also take our medicine in fearless poise: we assail our own integrity if we cringe, or wail, or run away.

6. We must exhibit courtesy for every other person's self-respect and cultivate tolerance among our fellow members and fellow citizens. Both "churches" and "states" must have genuine sympathy for self-respect in order to be true to essential character and function. Our sympathy as citizens (and as a nation) for the self-respect of citizens of other nations is also involved.

7. We must accept every opportunity to exemplify and inculcate prophetic educational leadership as to individual integrity, service and sacrifice—all in the Spirit of the Great Teacher who was done to death through the intimidation of the government by intolerant, malicious leaders of the established ecclesiastical order.

BOOK REVIEWS

SPEAKING OF RELIGION. Bruce Curry. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons. 1935. Pp. xiv, 205. $1.50.

THIS book offers an approach to current problems of religion. Its intent is to answer the question, What kind of religion can sustain the life of the modern world and meet its profound spiritual needs? The author has written from the background of a very intimate acquaintance with the questing and questioning of students in America. In this volume he seems to be suggesting a point of departure from which one may derive answers to the profounder problems of religion in modern life.

All questions in religion are resolved into two, Is religion possible? and Is it necessary? Professor Curry does not believe that all forms and types of religion are possible for a thoughtful modern. In fact vast ranges of religion are considered irrelevant, when not actually deleterious to our modern life. But he is profoundly anxious to say that religion of a high order is not only possible, but a primary necessity without which life will be impoverished and self-destructive.

The author differentiates between good and bad religion (whether Christian or non-Christian), that is, between "high religion" and "low religion." The latter is "low intellectually and ethically and finally puts its trust in material power." "High religion" is intellectually respectable, ethically sensitive, progressive, and relies ultimately upon spiritual rather than material forces. From this basic definition all else follows.

The range of issues discussed may be gathered from the fact that he discusses the belief in God, the value of the Bible, problems of good and evil, vital religious experience, and organized religion. Obviously none of these issues can be treated exhaustively. His chapter on religion and social change will be especially pertinent to many youths who are troubled either by the futility of sentimentalism or the frustration which follows upon non-religious social idealism. The chapter on High Christianity and other religions, raises many vast and complicated issues which seem unduly simplified. The section on Modern Trends suggests the inadequacy of "scientism," success, æstheticism, social idealism and unyielding pessimism to meet modern man's needs. One gathers that "high religion" would conserve the values of both, but not completely endorse the "isms" of Protestant liberals, conservatives, Barth or Buchman. The section on Nationalism applies to European, rather than Far-Eastern movements which have their roots far deeper than in our modern disillusionment.

If one will take the book for what it is, a preface to discussion of the problems of religion, it should prove of great value. It will open for intelligent inquirers many fruitful lines of thought leading to the steadying and enrichment of life experiences.

PAUL J. BRAISTED.

THE CHURCH AND SOCIETY. F. Ernest Johnson. New York: The Abingdon Press. 1935. Pp. 224. $1.50

THE author's basic studies as a secretary of the Federal Council of the Churches of Christ in America have equipped him with material to write this critique on the social

function of the church. The book is marked by sanity and comprehensiveness. The reader will find appraisals of Morrison, Niebuhr, Barth, Lippmann and other social ethicians that are rarely discriminating. The tangled questions of evangelism, prohibition, pacifism and capital-labor conflict are explored with an uncanny regard for human values. There is no effort to press the teachings of Jesus into harmony with the ideals of our times in order to acclaim New Testament sanction for the social gospel. Quoting Whitehead, "As society is now constituted a literal adherence to the moral precepts scattered throughout the Gospels would mean sudden death."

The reader is not left without clearest references to the author's constructive view-point. On many pages his principles of church function stand forth as ringing challenges. The social gospel is Jesus' ideal of life applied to the structure of a *continuing* society. Changing times precipitate changing problems and new ones, and call for a pragmatic Christian ethic. The validity of a human value inheres in its timeliness, its workableness, and the degree that it integrates persons not only in the inner life but also in their social relations. The historic dualisms of body and spirit and of individual and society are wiped out by an understanding of the nature of the social process.

Broadly speaking, the church serves two purposes in conditioning the moral life of men. In times of social crisis when particular human values are at stake, minorities within it take a stand for justice, freedom or the right, as the case may be. This position is illustrated, for instance, in Christian action against the steel industry and on behalf of shorter working hours for its men. Under such circumstances the church functions as a "pressure group." It is the gospel of social action, concerning which we hear much today. The church also has the responsibility to sponsor social education among its members. This is the long-range approach to human issues and promises eventual and dependable changes in the attitudes of economic and political institutions toward the well-being of mankind.

The reviewer thinks that Johnson has imposed on the church a weightier burden in carrying out this second function than it is able to bear. Should not the moral obligation to educate for the good life be placed upon the public school, the university, the family and other cultural groups, and until it is borne here, is there much hope that men will express altruistic impulses in their corporate life?

STEWART G. COLE.

THE PROTESTANT CHURCH AS A SOCIAL INSTITUTION. H. Paul Douglass and Edmund deS. Brunner. New York: Harper and Brothers. Published for the Institute of Social and Religious Research. 1935. Pp. xv, 368. $2.50.

SINCE 1921, when the Institute of Social and Religious Research was organized, this foundation has published seventy-eight volumes of social studies. With few exceptions, these publications have made signal contributions to the understanding of various phases of contemporary churchmanship. "The religious volumes were social studies in form, and the sociological studies were religious in purpose." New standards of measuring religious forces and new methods of appraising religious processes were established and used with generous samplings of religious conditions throughout America. No churchman can claim to understand the church situation in open country, village, town or city, who has not weighed these materials carefully. It is amazing what an amount of discriminating data has been gathered and assimilated by the Institute in such a brief time-span. Douglass and Brunner have assumed con-

siderable responsibility throughout the research project, the former in the field of urban life and the latter in the study of rural life. The above-mentioned volume is the last production to be released by the Institute. Every student of American Christianity trusts that a decade or two later in our history another institute may be organized with a view to restudying the social scenes and remapping the religious trends of our times. Such strategy is becoming indispensable to the introduction of statesmanship into corporate religion.

The Protestant Church as a Social Institution may be justly described as the crowning volume of the series. The most significant findings that accrued from various previous studies, together with materials from *Recent Social Trends in the United States* (by President Hoover's Research Committee) and volume two of *The Education of American Ministers* (Mark A. May), have been interpreted to furnish the reader a valid guide of the functioning church in our times. The book is replete with tables and charts that lend graphic meaning to research data. Probably the most revealing section of the study is part three, dealing with "Conditioning Factors." If local ministers were familiar with the view-point that is presented here and if they were to act upon it, they could reorient Christianity and make it a vital force for our revolutionary age. In part four the authors present "Foreshadowings," prospects and policies of the church and promises of church unity. Sober prediction on the basis of well-established tendencies leaves no quarter for wish-thinking in these closing chapters.

The reviewer's chief interest for the moment lies in the first chapter. Here the authors make a frank confession of the reception that the publications of the Institute of Social and Religious Research have had at the hands of churchmen themselves. "All told, resistance to the scientific study of the church from church sources has been thrown into relief as a major phenomenon by fourteen years of experience." "The superiority complex of professionals and the burnt-finger attitude of the Protestant masses are in instinctive rebellion against objective studies of the church and are inclined to give them grudging cooperation, if any." In other words, Christian leaders have not shown any pronounced concern to understand the conditions of their structural faith with a view to rehabilitating it in terms of the changing conditions of American civilizaton. Zeal for the cause or mechanization within it has crowded out the spirit of objective inquiry. Churchmen remain idea-minded rather than process-aware and tend to perpetuate a priestly cult. Eventually, the centrality of doctrinal issues will give way to socially vital ones in church strategy and another new day for Protestantism will have dawned.

STEWART G. COLE.

TOWARD BELIEF. Hoxie Neale Fairchild, Assistant Professor of English, Barnard College. New York: The Macmillan Company. 1935. Pp. ix and 157. $1.75.

THE title of this volume is modest in view of the success attained by its author in presenting his personal experience with religion in a convincing way. In 1933 he was a sceptic, a year later he found himself a Christian. He tells what took place in his mind during that year.

This fact gives the book its major interest. It is well-written as befits a professor of English; its arguments, while not new, are presented with delightful freshness; its illustrations are fitting and reveal insight rather than cleverness; but above all else, it has that ring of sincerity which wins the respect of the reader.

The chapter on "Seeking a Christian Church" is by far the longest in the book.

All through it the reader wonders as to the nature of the soil from which this luxuriant growth springs. The explanation is in the last sentence—"Finally, in order to possess Christianity in what seems to me its rational, inclusive, beautiful, and efficacious form, I have come to the altar of Episcopalianism—the church in which I was baptized thirty-nine years ago."

When this repentant, rationalistic prodigal, who wandered for twenty years in the far country of scepticism, came to himself and turned his wandering feet toward his father's house, his journey's end was—Anglo-Catholicism.

No benighted traditionalist is this writer. He pleads stoutly for the "open mind," for a "dynamic orthodoxy . . . which moves onward with the march of intellect, gladly absorbs all genuine knowledge, and grants to all believers the free use of critical thought and speech." At the same time he holds to the idea of one Holy and Apostolic church, with a sacerdotal ministry and a sacramental worship.

These comments are necessarily so brief that they cannot do full justice to the book and its author, whose final plea is, not that the reader "should become an Anglican,, but that he should think hard about religion and follow his thought through to some definite, workable conclusion."

RITTENHOUSE NEISSER.

THE PHILOSOPHY OF A BIOLOGIST. J. S. Haldane. New York: Oxford University Press. 1935. Pp. xii, 155. $2.50.

SCIENCE by itself is an inadequate guide to life. Scientific knowledge is unavoidably piecemeal, because the scientific way is to deal with particular problems. Philosophy, on the other hand, takes a comprehensive view of life and the universe. It undertakes a synthesis of the data which are brought to light by the sciences. Thus the sciences need philosophy for their completion and interpretation. Professor Haldane is one of the men whose chief concern is with the world of science, but who realizes the necessity of transcending that sphere to understand the data of science.

In the present volume, the author undertakes to show the bearing of philosophy on physical science, biology, psychology and on religion. The result of his study has led him to align himself with the personal idealists. Reality is capable of interpretation from any of these points of view, but the conclusion tenable is that "the real universe is a universe of personality and the manifestation of God," and such recognition is necessarily practical. Haldane has a most penetrating discussion of the debate between the mechanists and teleologists, and from the standpoint of a faith in the ultimate consistency of our universe of experience rejects mechanism. It is a distinct contribution to the philosophy of religion.

A. STEWART WOODBURNE.

THE PASTOR AT WORK IN CHRISTIAN EDUCATION. Henry G. Weston Smith. Philadelphia: The Judson Press. 1935. Pp. 110. $1.00.

FOR eleven years the author has been the minister of one of the largest churches in eastern Pennsylvania. Today he is more strongly attached to his parish and more firmly entrenched in the hearts of his people than ever. The qualitative ideal of his ministry rather than the quantitative aspects of his church explain this rewarding pastorate. Not only has he enlisted zest in his leadership but he has organized the church's program in terms of an educational policy.

This handbook presents a partial blue-print of Smith's approach to church work.

The Sunday school, rather than encompassing his program of Christian education, is the center from which emanates a purpose that touches and controls activities in every organization and club of his parish. Lay leadership, rightly trained and supervised, takes care of a far-reaching and inclusive educational enterprise. It is unfortunate that the author devoted so much attention to the mechanics of this project and neglected to treat of the fundamentally spiritual purposes that undergird his work and that give it its chief value. For instance, if he had applied the seven objectives of Christian education, mentioned in chapter one, to multiple activities of his parish and if he had shown how these actually become incarnated in flesh and blood, the value of this text would have been greatly improved. And it would have represented more considerately his contribution to the pastoral calling.

STEWART G. COLE.

SOCIAL AND RELIGIOUS PROBLEMS OF YOUNG PEOPLE. Sidney A. Weston and S. Ralph Harlow. New York: The Abingdon Press. 1934. Pp. 288. $1.75.

THIS book will attract considerable attention in young people's study groups. In the hands of a skilled discussion leader it should prove highly useful. The authors have had wide contacts with the younger generation in the churches, have sensed their questing interests, and know how to present materials to lead them out into a richer faith. Remote from the indoctrinal approach, the handbook opens up a score of critical questions in youth-life and leaves the group free to think through their own solutions. Nine chapters deal with "social" issues and the remainder with "religious" themes. All are realistic in import. The authors have adopted the pattern of presenting a problem, breaking it open, suggesting an objective, and then reporting a hypothetical discussion upon the subject in which six persons participate. Varieties of view-points are presented, though there is a tendency to close the issue in terms of the position which the authors assume that Jesus would take.

STEWART G. COLE.

THE YOUNGER CHURCHMEN LOOK AT THE CHURCH. Edited by Ralph H. Read. Introduction by Kirby Page. New York: The Macmillan Company. Pp. xvi, 345. 1935. $2.50.

EIGHTEEN churchmen, most of them identified with The Conference for Younger Churchmen (a Metropolitan New York fellowship), have spoken their mind with reference to the work of the church. None of them considers that Protestantism is in a wholesome condition. Judgment varies from the rather restrained criticism that the editor pens in the preface to the alarmist view-point expressed by Kirby Page in the introduction. All agree that religion's major handicap is its failure to affect seriously our pagan economic order. The values of Jesus have no currency in Main Street. Private capital has disregarded the well-being of society. Socialism, qualified by the New Testament gospel, must be adopted by America or our civilization will collapse for want of moral integrity.

Most of the contributors are under forty years of age. They include John C. Bennett, E. R. Clinchy, Edmund Chaffee and H. S. Leiper. Presbyterians and Congregationalists predominate. A brief biography of each man is appended to his essay.

There is no doubt that the religious trend which these men represent has a strong grip upon the church. There is passion and conviction in this social gospel.

It strikes a realistic note and augurs hopefully for the Christian cause. Although a small minority in the church's cause, they are not quitters; on the contrary, they are churchmen in earnest who will render a spiritual ministry in this day of crisis in church and society. The reviewer thinks that the papers these men have written would have been improved much if they had attempted two additional purposes. The writers could have agreed upon stressing a more comprehensive and constructive ministry for the church in our time without detracting from the individuality of their contributions. The social gospel, which these men enunciate, could have been supported philosophically with a more distinctly religious sanction. It suffers for lack of spiritual authority, emanating from sources other than the wishes of good men.

STEWART G. COLE.

RELIGIOUS BELIEF AND CHARACTER AMONG JEWISH ADOLESCENTS. Abraham N. Franzblau. New York: Bureau of Publications, Teachers' College, Columbia University. Pp. viii, 80. $1.50.

THE professor of Jewish religious education at Hebrew Union College has attempted to discover whether there is any necessary relation between youth's acceptance of traditional religious dogmas and their acquisition of superior personal character. Although it has been assumed by Jews (and Christians) that a close relation pertains, the author discovered no evidence to support the principle. He used a battery of thirteen standard tests, preparatory to the religious-idea test he himself developed and standardized, with over seven hundred adolescents in synagogue schools. Maturity, sex and home-background factors were taken into account in interpreting the findings. The summary of correlations deny many of the popular claims made by parents and churchmen concerning the value of loyalty to traditional religious beliefs. Franzblau's scholarly research supports the claims advanced by Hartshorne and May in their Character Education Inquiry.

STEWART G. COLE.

SOCIAL ORGANIZATION AND DISORGANIZATION. Stuart A. Queen, Walter B. Bodenhofer and Ernest B. Harper. New York: T. Y. Crowell Company. Pp. xii, 653. $3.50

BECAUSE the religious leader, by reason of the nature of his intellectual bent, is inclined to approach persons, groups and social institutions atomistically, he should read at least one outstanding text in sociology every six months. This book may be soundly recommended. Much that the churchman senses concerning persons-in-relation but cannot put into understanding language, he will find articulated here in readable and dependable form. Of course, one must master the vernacular of the social scientist. That is set forth in chapter two and is by no means as formidable as the untutored might suppose. Perhaps what will disturb the peace of mind of the reader most is the necessity of learning to abandon an oversimplifying approach to the problems of human beings.

The main sections of the text deal with "groups," "institutions" and "personalities." The authors approach these social forces as psychically interactionary and in unbroken process of favorable or unfavorable adjustment. Much attention is given to the most recent factors in our civilization that contribute to the disorganization of the several phases of society. A fine balance in perspective is struck between the importance of the individual and the group in social evolution. Queen, who writes

three-fifths of the contents of the volume, is well known in sociological circles as an astute scholar and a generous contributor to the literature of social science.

STEWART G. COLE.

PREFACE TO RELIGION. Bernard Iddings Bell. New York: Harper and Brothers. 1935. Pp. xii, 198. $1.75

THE writer is well known as an author, lecturer and college preacher. He defines religion as "the attempt of man to relate himself to an elusive Something Else," "a mysterious directive power behind and in all things." The concepts of the supernatural, sin, redemption by sacrifice and grace are basic to religions. The cult, the creed and the code are further aspects of religion which lend themselves to examination. The development of Hebrew religion was the result of the failure of the Jews as a nation. The attempt to reconcile this with their conviction that they were the chosen people of Yahweh issued in the ideas of the Remnant, the Messiah, and the Servant.

Christianity is presented as "what eventuated when Judaism, come to its complete and logical development, was wedded to Greek thought and organized by Roman genius." The Nicene Creed is looked upon as the "official Creed of Christianity" authoritative to Protestant and Catholic alike. The Christian cult is sacramental. In baptism the candidate is made "a child of God"; in the Holy Communion "the faithful are fed by sacrament with Jesus' very self." Christian conduct is based upon a few basic moral principles, the greatest of which is "love." The story of the Christian age centers around the conflict of the Church and State. By the middle of the thirteenth century "the Church was in supreme command of Western civilization." "The Church remade the world." This was possible because the social order was "emerging" and was not "settled." As it became settled, the Church was corrupted by those who worked their way in for worldly purposes, until it became so debauched that decent people insisted upon its reformation. The political powers seized upon this as their opportunity to break the unity of Christendom and bring "the Church to heel." As a result the chief general types of non-Roman Christianity in the West have been characterized by "a too great willingness to be dominated by the nationalistic state and by capitalist interests."

The last chapter is devoted to a brief but vigorous discussion of the four great problems faced by Christianity today: "(1) An intellectual problem, the relationship of Christian Creed and Modern Thought; (2) a devotional problem, the restoration of vitality to Christian Worship; (3) a moral problem, the reestablishment of the Church's liberty to bring statecraft and business to the judgment seat of the Christ; and (4) an ecclesiastical problem, the restoration of unity to that Kingdom of Jesus which is the Church."

While the author leans decidedly toward sacramentalism, he has a breadth of view that wins the sympathy of the thoughtful reader. His book is outstanding in the way in which it arouses interest, challenges indifference, shocks complacency, awakens thought and cultivates Christian attitudes.

RITTENHOUSE NEISSER.

New Relationships with Jews and Catholics. Discussion Outlines for Protestant Groups. Mrs. Abel J. Gregg. New York: Association Press. Pp. 64. 1934. 25 cents.

Under the guidance of broad-minded, religious leaders, an increasing number of Protestant young people are anxious to get acquainted with their neighbors, Roman Catholics and Jews. This handbook, which has the endorsement of the National Conference of Jews and Christians and the International Council of Religious Education, is admirably adapted for the use of youth. Attitude, social-distance and opinion tests and rating scales are interjected through the six divisions of the handbook to furnish young people a basis for measuring their practical interest in interfaith fellowship. Reference material and timely questions challenge prejudice and arouse tolerance, understanding, good-will, as youth yields to the logic of facts.

Stewart G. Cole.

One Light Burning. R. C. Hutchinson. New York: Farrar and Rinehart, Inc. 1935. $2.50.

Here we have a novel of high adventure, of deep and true devotion, and of magnificent faith. Its beginning is a bit misleading, but after Andrew is introduced one is carried along with him and perhaps by him. He is the head of a party which makes a long and hazardous trip through Siberia in search of a lost theologian. One of his party dies of exposure; another is crippled; and finally the Soviet Government deports them, so that their difficulties end, apparently, in failure. As a result of his hardships and worries, Andrew becomes the victim of a strange and dreadful insomnia. Through all his troubles he is borne along by the strength of his love and the faith that God will suffer him to live until he again finds Greta. The story ends happily, and conveniently, with the restoration of the lost scholar and Andrew's cure in the sanctuary of Greta's love.

The story is somewhat improbable, and in spots the development thereof is rather artificial. But Mr. Hutchinson's descriptive powers deserve high commendation. One feels the vastness of the Siberian wastes and the slowness of action in the Soviet Union. One suffers through the tedium and fatigue of Andrew's long and uninterrupted wakefulness, but the emotion of this reader was one of sympathy rather than of boredom.

Although the story seems a bit stilted, the book is enjoyable because of the author's skill in creating the effect of limitless monotony without making his style monotonous.

Patricia Woodburne.

The Rediscovery of John Wesley. George Croft Cell. New York: Henry Holt and Company. 1935. Pp. 420. $2.50.

This rediscovery of the great founder of Methodism consists largely in the contradiction of three traditional interpretations of John Wesley—that he was a mystic, a High-churchman with indeed certain leanings, perhaps, toward Roman Catholicism, and that he was opposed to Calvinism. The author, who states that his book "is the outcome of a literary project and the solution of a problem which has occupied my time once and again for the past twenty-five years," takes exception to these views concerning the dauntless and tireless preacher, held not alone by most of his numerous followers but as well by the majority of students in general.

That Wesley was not a mystic seems proved by his unrelenting, imperious drive against all manner of social evils prevalent in his day. This he considered his mission and to such tasks he led his forces, establishing his new organization to effect such pragmatic ends. And his methods of open-air meetings in order to reach the unprivileged and unchurched, his utter freedom from formalities, the definition of his gospel as of free grace confutes the possibility of his being a High-church reactionary.

The certainty of his sound Calvinism is not so well established. The author bases his argument for this position on the fact that though Wesley's message was one of salvation by faith yet he emphasized the doctrinal point that "saving faith" is "God's work for us in Christ and in us by the Holy Spirit." But is that necessarily Calvinism? The question is, What is Calvinism? The tendency today is to take one minute segment of Calvin's system as constituting the whole. Because a preacher may agree with the Genevan Reformer in one word, must he have the entire label attached to him?

For instance in his chapter on "The Decay of Religion," Mr. Cell recounts how Wesley inveighed against the growth of riches among his followers. "As many of them increase in worldly goods, their great danger, I apprehend, will be their relapsing into the spirit of the world, and then their religion is but a dream." Again: "I gave our brethren at Bristol a solemn warning not to love the world, neither the things of the world. This will be their great danger. As they are industrious and frugal, they will needs increase in goods." How does this compare with Calvin's statements: "We must recognize this is a general principle, that riches come not at all to men through their own virtue, nor wisdom, nor toil, but only by the blessing of God." "Though some men seem to enrich themselves by vigilance, nevertheless it is God who blesses and cares for them. Though others are rich before they are born, and their fathers have acquired great possessions, nevertheless this is not by accident, but the providence of God rules over it." "So let us not attribute it at all to fortune when we see one rich and another poor, but let us recognize that God so disposes, and it is not without reason."

If Wesley was Calvinistic, to what extent was he? And to what extent Arminian?

R. E. E. Harkness.

Saint Thomas and the Problem of the Soul in the Thirteenth Century. Anton Charles Pegis. Toronto: The Institute of the Mediæval Studies. 1934. Pp. 213. $2.50.

Saint Thomas Aquinas—The Compendium Theologiæ. Ross J. Dunn. Toronto: The Institute of Mediæval Studies. 1934. Pp. 194. 90 cents.

The Church and the World. Martin J. Scott. New York: P. J. Kenedy & Sons. 1934. Pp. 263. $1.50.

The first of these books from the Roman Catholic Press is an interpretation of the theology of this great Father of the Church whose system of thought more than any other theologian set the doctrinal view of the Church. The work was originally presented in 1931 as a thesis for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy in the University of Toronto.

The second is a translation from the Latin of one of the best-known works of Saint Thomas written "for Brother Reginald, His Most Dear Friend."

The third work is frankly a piece of propaganda for the Church and an apology for its opposition to certain hypotheses of natural science. Its ingenious defense of the persecution of some of the early scientists whose views ran counter to the accepted doctrines of the day is at times most interesting. The author evidently speaks for the Church on these historic matters as well as for its present-day attitude toward such questions as birth-control and marriage, since his publishers advertise themselves as "Publishers to the Holy Apostolic See."

R. E. E. Harkness.

The Anabaptists—Their Contribution to Our Protestant Heritage. R. J. Smithson. London: James Clarke & Co., Ltd. 1935. Pp. 228. 5s. net.

Long, and too long, have the Anabaptists been misunderstood, their name clouded by the doctrine and conduct of certain extremists driven desperate by frustrated hopes and cruel persecution on the part of those whose new profession of faith seemingly gave them promise of sympathetic understanding and generous support. But these lowly folk in the light of that new-found encouragement seeking freedom and the rightful opportunities of human kind discovered in this profession not friendliness but hostile suppression.

Such is the welcome contribution, long overdue, which Doctor Smithson ably makes to the story of this important religious body and to this significant period in the history of the Christian Church. He has not only cleared the name of a whole group whose descendants still remain with us but he has helped us to see without prejudice their origins in the social order of that period and the worthy hopes and purposes of their endeavor. Indeed in many respects the Reformation has not yet caught up with these prophets of four hundred years ago in their insistence upon the worth of human personality, the right of economic as well as religious and civil liberty and of the common opportunities of education and other social values. This radicalism, so extreme for that far-away day, and still progressive for our own, accounts in large measure for the opposition so strenuously presented by the privileged classes and for the contumely under which the name Anabaptist has dwelt all these years.

Doctor Smithson by faithful research and sane insight has given us an intelligent interpretation of this movement in all its branches and a trustworthy analysis of the contribution its principles have made to the religious and civil life of the world. Of special value is his balanced and accurate judgment of the relationship of Anabaptism to the later religious bodies such as the Mennonites, Baptists, Quakers and Christian Brethren.

R. E. E. Harkness.

Christ and Evolution. George A. Barton. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press. 1934. Pp. 166. $2.00.

Out of a wide experience the well-known author attempts to exemplify the way in which the doctrine of Redemption may be presented with meaning and conviction to a generation permeated with modern science. On the background of a full acceptance of the Theory of Evolution the central doctrines of the Christian Religion are shown to be still of vital significance. However, the content of such doctrines, as one would expect, are modified.

The author finds that sin is not due to a "fall" from a former state of perfection; rather it is the consequence of the birth of moral consciousness in man. The

purpose of redemption is to complete the growth of this moral consciousness. In the process of evolution he discovers a God who is personal, not angry with men, but sympathetic and loving in his great creative endeavor. To complete man's moral and spiritual growth came Jesus Christ as the supreme ethical ideal. Not in metaphysical substance, but in ethical character, Jesus is One with God. The end to be attained is the kingdom of God, for ethical character needs social life if it is to attain its fullness. The tremendous progress made by man in the short time since the dawn of conscience as compared with the vastly longer time consumed in physical evolution gives encouragement in the hope for the kingdom of God, for there are millions upon millions of years for further achievement in spiritual evolution.

For those who are in confusion, and find it difficult to relate the Christian religion to a scientific outlook, this book will be valuable. It is written in language that the ordinary layman can understand with ease. The discussion centers on the great problems—Sin, God, Christ, Redemption, Creeds and Theologies.

A valuable feature is the numerous references in footnotes to various authors and their opposing positions with regard to the subjects treated. A proper use of such references will acquaint the reader with authorities in the field, as well as add profoundly to his appreciation of the problems involved.

D. J. Evans.

Urban Organization of Protestantism. Wilbur C. Hallenbeck. New York: Harper and Brothers. Published for the Institute of Social and Religious Research. 1934. Pp. xii, 285. $1.50.

In this volume the denominational city church extension societies in eight leading cities are described in terms of purposes, powers and resources. The author considers that such agencies are "the bottlenecks through which the development of the churching of the city must flow" and that they "can either facilitate or hinder the flow." In addition to the factual material in part one is a rich content of source information in tables and charts in the appendix of the book. Part two deals with "interpretations": problems, philosophy and procedure.

How institutionalized and opportunistic our Protestant societies are in urban situations is presented clearly in these closing chapters. Instead of facing frankly the forces of social change that rest new burdens of adjustment upon churches and mission agencies, their leaders tend to take refuge in *laissez-faire,* either pietistic or administrative. There is little evidence of desire to understand current social trends in metropolitan centers or to rethink the place of corporate religious life in terms of the conditions of this machine age. Suppose the leading churchmen in a city came together to ask critically, "How can we church our city?" what would happen?

Stewart G. Cole.

A Christian Manifesto. Edwin Lewis. New York: The Abingdon Press. 1934. Pp. 245. $2.00.

This volume, by Prof. Edwin Lewis, Drew Theological Seminary, commends itself especially to the preaching pastor.

It can be well imagined that it has not been enthusiastically received by the vanguard of theological thinkers very largely because it seems to stop and take stock rather than go ahead into new fields of theological adventure. However, the task of pastoral preaching is one of the most serious and exhausting which falls upon

the minister of the gospel today, and the more up-to-date and thoughtful he is the more exacting that becomes for the very obvious reason that he is the interpreter to people upon one level of thinking of people of a much higher cultural level, or at least, if not higher, of a different level.

The reviewer believes that Professor Lewis' book is the most timely and beneficial of its kind that has come to the perplexed preacher in quite some time. Its principal purpose seems to be to get behind the scenes of historical theological thinking and to reveal what the realities are, however changed the patterns of thought.

The writer insists that, despite the changed expressions and views of our twentieth century, there is something sound, valid and eternally worth while in the old doctrines. The form in which they were stated can no longer be used but they were effective in their day. Much of this volume is given over to the task of showing what there was in these great doctrines of the past which can never be dispensed with.

Dealing with the matter of the Christian faith itself and its statement in the New Testament, the following quotation reveals just what Doctor Lewis is doing in this book. Recounting the difficulties of the Gospels and their stories as judged by modern criticism he says: "What is witnessed to is a faith, and the facts from which the faith sprang, and the life and experience which the faith nourished. In a very profound sense, our only concern is with that witness. What one thing is all the time being said?—that is what matters, and that is all that matters. Associated with the central witness are innumerable matters of only secondary importance."

Many a harassed parish preacher will find comfort and aid in the reading of Chapter II of this book entitled "The Goodly Heritage." Chapter III, from which the above statement is quoted, is of the greatest help in the orientation of one's mind toward this whole perplexing duty of transferring gospel thought into present-day preaching.

Just how Doctor Lewis comes to the rescue of the preaching profession is amply and vividly shown on page 88: "The final evidence to the resurrection, however, is not documentary, as is necessarily the case with the miracles of the public ministry, but institutional, and, I will dare to add, permanently experiential. That is to say, today as in the past, Christ may 'appear' to men in the way, bearing evidences of his presence just as indubitable as those that overwhelmed the questioning Thomas or the persecuting Saul of Tarsus."

Nor is the author unwilling or afraid to face the ultimate charge of being a supernaturalist. Note again his words: "The Christian faith is founded not on a discourse but on a miracle. It may very well be that you do not like miracle. It is your privilege to say what you will believe, but it is not your privilege to destroy Christianity. For what is left when the great miracle is denied is not Christianity at all: it is an emasculated thing, utterly unable to account for its own origin and its own persistence." A good shot at a purely scientific approach is well taken also when our author says: "We ask for a universe which has in it a place for the poet, the musician, the artist, the seer, the mystic, and the saint. If science and philosophy cannot give us such a universe, then we shall simply claim that the universe they do give is incomplete."

So, there is arrayed before us in this volume, much after the same fashion already described, Sin, Atonement, and Incarnate God in succeeding chapters—all with the same purpose of getting us back to the realities which terms have obscured.

There is something wholesome in the book because it will not be acclaimed very loudly by ultramodern theologians and it certainly will not be accepted by the ultra-fundamentalist. It takes a brave man nowadays to follow the middle of the road. To a large extent, this is what Doctor Lewis has done and he must expect brickbats from both directions.

The reviewer is thankful for this warm-hearted, clearly written, sensible exposition of the great truths of the Christian faith and hopes that many of his fellow preachers may find time and interest to read it.

GEORGE F. FINNIE.

CHRIST AND THE WORLD OF THOUGHT. Daniel Lamont, D. D., Professor of Practical Theology, New College, Edinburgh. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons. Pp. viii, 301. $3.75.

THIS book is a brilliant piece of special pleading which begins with the avowed purpose of considering "What is the true relation of thought to human life as a whole" and ends by insisting that so far as reaching a vital knowledge as to the meaning and destiny of human life is concerned, "thought is bankrupt."

The first part of the book is concerned with the Frontier of Thought. In it the writer shows a wide knowledge of present-day thinking in science and philosophy, and an unusual facility in expressing his ideas clearly. He discusses relativity, the fourth dimension, and concrete and abstract time, in a way which holds the interest of the reader. "The essential limitations of human thinking" are presented as being acknowledged by the thinkers, and it is urged that "life must go farther than mere thinking can carry it."

The characteristic attitude of science is declared to be the observer-attitude. This attitude is not assumed in self-consciousness, nor in the reciprocal relationship between friends; these require the person-attitude. "The Present is the realm in which our lives are wholly spent" and "the Present defies the observer-attitude." At the same time we "do know the Present." In the present I am acted upon by other wills, but some of the facts of life are so momentous as to compel us to admit "a power which is other and more than human." This power the author calls the "Absolute," the "Eternal Present."

The second part of the book considers the Heritage of Faith. It is said that when reason comes to a boundary which it cannot pass, it must call for the help of faith. While the human tendency is to "disparage the idea of a divine Revelation" there is no conclusive reason against the possibility of such a Revelation. The author claims that "the Christian Revelation is perfect and final." This is recognized by those only who take the faith-attitude; that is, the Revelation must be seen from a view-point "within the Revelation itself." Jesus Christ is the heart and center of Christian Revelation, and Christian faith recognizes him as "Divine Lord and Saviour."

In discussing the Christian Idea of the Universe, Doctor Lamont calls attention to the difficult problem of the distortion of the world through evil and issues the warning that "to explain sin is always to explain it away." He concludes that there "must be another will-form . . . which acts as a negative to the universal will-form," namely Satan. In commenting on the reaction of the "modern mind," to this idea he says that in this matter the "modern mind" is defective.

In this same vein the author discusses the Trinity, stopping to give considerable

attention to the resurrection of Jesus. He insists that the "Risen Body of Jesus" was "a new and unique Divine Creation," to which witness could be borne only by people of faith. In other words, that it "could not be visible to unbelieving eyes." The parousia of Jesus is represented as occurring about the time of the destruction of Jerusalem after which the Christians who died would no longer enter a state called "sleep," but would "wake" at once into the Presence of the Lord.

The final chapter is an earnest plea for personal decision. "Faith cannot be separated from the Great Decision," which is "for Jesus Christ as Divine Lord and Saviour."

The volume is the finished production of a Scotch dialectician. The scientist is shown some consideration, especially in his admission that he doesn't know it all; an attitude worthy of emulation. The psychologist is denied the name of scientist, for if science must confine itself to the objective method, and if personality, my own or another's, cannot be studied by this method, then psychology is not a science. As for the theologian, and the scientific student of the Bible, they are hobbled by a conservatism that can see but one worthy object—the defense of conventional orthodoxy, with personal variations. With the impatience of the zealot the writer exclaims, "Will the modern mind ever learn that the Word of God is independent of anything that science can ever prove or disprove."

Reading such a book is an interesting adventure; it awakens the mind, arouses antagonism, and confirms the faith of those who already have it.

RITTENHOUSE NEISSER.

A RAINBOW FOR EVERY CLOUD. David M. Gardner, First Baptist Church, St. Petersburg, Florida. 1935. Pp. 105. $1.00.

A GREATER THAN SOLOMON. Robert G. Lee, Bellevue Baptist Church, Memphis, Tenn. Nashville: Broadman Press. 1935. Pp. 160. $1.00.

GOD'S HEART TOUCH. Elias Dodson Poe. Nashville, Tenn.: Sunday School Board of Southern Baptist Convention. 1935. Pp. 157. $1.00.

THESE three volumes present three of our Southern Baptist preachers, revealing the types of sermons which they preach weekly to their people. They are thoroughgoing, biblical sermons and deal with the problems of every-day life.

GEORGE F. FINNIE.

VALUES AND REALITY: A PREFACE TO SANE LIVING. Leo Richard Ward. New York: Sheed and Ward, Inc. 1935. Pp. 331. $3.00.

THE author is professor in the University of Notre Dame. His book is a suggestive contribution to current literature on ethics. The author's own note on the arrangement of material gives an adequate picture of the contents. "The work is in three parts: on valuing and value and ends; on ends and standards; on standards and values. Valuing and value are studied in their natural order: valuing and its data, then 'value.' The latter is the field of means and end, and is defined in terms of end. Hence we try to denote the end, or 'chief good of all.'"

In the second part, we begin by trying to say what a standard does. Then, as an attempt to find the standard, John Dewey's theory of values is studied. Also new humanism, in one aspect: as a professed seeking of the best ways to the best

ends. Then we state what we think a standard is, in Plato and in Saint Thomas and in fact. After that we evaluate the social will as standard.

In the third part, an endeavor is made to use the standard, and suggest transvaluations: in matters of money, order, balance, integration, reverence. The work inquires into the conditions of any intelligible solution of the problems involved.

Thus modestly the author states his task. He puts before the reader the results of thinking concerning the permanently human question, What is Good? His own answer is the only one worthy of a teacher dealing with values distinctively human. The subtitle accurately described what is the issue. "Sane Living" will be achieved by the help of this volume, if readers heed the lessons of history.

An index readily helps the student to locate material, if he wishes to review passages that stimulate reflection. He will find many such. MILTON G. EVANS.

CAPITALISM AND ITS CULTURE. Jerome Davis, Yale University. New York: Farrar and Rinehart. 1935. Pp. xix, 556. $3.00.

THE author of this volume has undertaken a more comprehensive study of the cultural aspects of capitalism than has hitherto been attempted. And he has accomplished his aim with conspicuous success. There is no other book available that discloses so well to the reader the far reaches and ramifications of capitalistic influence. The work is analytical rather than propagandist. It makes a more staggering impression for the precise reason that it overwhelms one with the vastness of the data concerning the operations of capitalism.

In Part One we have the story of the rise of capitalism, its accomplishments and philosophy. Part Two scrutinizes the processes of capitalism in production, banking and high finance, the stock exchange, the investment trust, higher racketeering, debt, the manipulation of distribution and consumption, imperialistic politics and the race for profits. Part Three consists of a description of the products of capitalism, including a money-centered culture, commercialized recreational facilities, control of the press, radio monopoly, refracted education, an interlocking control of religion, a subsidized state, besides inequitable privileges and even partiality in moral judgments.

The great criticism of the operations of capitalism is that in an economy of plenty there should be so much scarcity. Professor Davis shows that the emphasis on the profit motive is diametrically opposed to the Christian emphasis on the worth of personality, the motive of service for others, the spirit of cooperation and the self-sacrificing love of the Gospels. It would be difficult to follow this study without concluding that the evils incident on capitalistic control far outweigh the benefits that accrue. Doctor Davis has placed us under a heavy obligation for his illuminating study.

A. STEWART WOODBURNE.

THE ETHICS OF THE CAMBRIDGE PLATONISTS. Eugene M. Austin. Philadelphia: published by the author for private circulation. 1935. Pp. 86.

THIS is a dissertation submitted by Mr. Austin to the University of Pennsylvania for the doctorate in philosophy. It is a careful examination of the ethics of the Cambridge Platonists, with a consideration of the influence of their thought on subsequent moralists. The body of the discussion is concerned with four pivotal problems and the solutions proposed. These are: (1) To what extent may moral

distinctions be regarded as permanent? (2) What psychological principle is operative in ethical judgments? (3) How are ethics and religion related in this system? and (4) What is the practical bearing of the system on life? Probably the most significant impression that the thesis makes on the reader is the emphasis of the Cambridge men on the interdependence of religion and ethics, a principle that is permanently relevant. We congratulate Mr. Austin on a dissertation that not only displays philosophic acumen, but literary skill.

A. Stewart Woodburne.

Religion and Communism. Julius F. Hecker, Ph. D. New York: John Wiley and Sons, Inc. 1934. Pp. xii, 303. $3.00.

The only way to understand the Russian revolution is with reference to its historical background. Doctor Hecker is eminently qualified to interpret it in that way, having been a resident of Russia and an intimate student of its affairs for a number of years. The volume under review is an admirable elucidation of the revolution with particular attention to its religious significance. The subtitle is "A Study of Religion and Atheism in Soviet Russia."

The story of religion in Russia before the revolution is the story of a church in alliance with imperialistic power, a church glorying in its wealth and prestige while the people were ground down and impoverished. It is no wonder that an antireligious movement should have originated in Russia. As Hecker shows, this began long before the Soviet Government came on the scene.

Soviet Russia is proceeding on the assumption that "a classless Communist civilization will have no religion, but it will have a spiritual culture and an integral philosophy of life." In other words, communism regards itself as self-sufficient. That means that Christianity is being put to the supreme test to prove its vitality in the face of deliberate efforts to suppress it. Our author thinks that the Christianity of the evangelical sects has a greater chance of survival than has that of the old Orthodox Church. The book depicts the methods by which the Soviets are trying to make atheism effective, and also describes the aspects of life through which religion must be saved, if at all.

A. Stewart Woodburne.

Reality in Religion. John MacNeill, Principal Theological Faculty of McMaster University. Philadelphia: The Judson Press. 1934. Pp. 158. $1.00.

The Sin of Being Ordinary. Frank B. Fagerburg, First Baptist Church, Los Angeles, Calif. Philadelphia: The Judson Press. 1934. Pp. 154. $1.00.

These two volumes by our Baptist press give an opportunity to those who may be interested to become acquainted with the preaching methods of one of Canada's great preachers and teachers, and one of the younger generation of our Baptist preachers here in the United States.

George F. Finnie.

Prize Sermons. "Church Management" Contest, 1934. Edited by William H. Leach. Nashville, Tenn.: Cokesbury Press. Pp. 222. $1.50.

This is a book of sermons by seventeen different preachers selected in a contest in which several hundred sermons were submitted. They cover a wide field of modern preaching and offer us the opportunity of seeing a cross section of what is being preached in the present-day pulpit.

George F. Finnie.

SOME STUDIES IN THE OLD TESTAMENT. H. F. B. Mackay. New York: The Macmillan Company. 1935. Pp. 205. $2.00.

HERE are twenty-four sermons that "were preached, mostly at All Saints, Margaret Street, during the years of the war." They are free and easy in their interpretation of Scripture and each one is the bearer of a practical, helpful message.

I. G. MATTHEWS.

MAIMONIDES. Solomon Zeitlin, Ph. D. New York: Bloch Publishing Co. 1935. Pp. x, 234. $2.00.

THIS year, 1935, marks the eight-hundredth anniversary of the birth of the subject of this volume. Only the high spots in the life of the great Jewish scholar have been touched, but this has added to the clarity of the narratives and gives the reader a good perspective of the man in the background of his period. These were stirring times. Maimonides lived through the second and the third crusades and saw Christian and Moslem in conflict for the Holy Land. The Jew, scattered throughout Europe, Arabia and Egypt suffered from both. Maimonides owing to his great learning became influential among all groups of Jewry. The author has treated briefly the chief contributions of the sage to the lore of Judaism, the Mishne Torah, the guide to the perplexed, and has given an estimate of his medical skill. He holds that he was the greatest scholar of Jewry since the completion of the Talmud and has endeavored to prove that he was a nationalist. The book is quite readable and presents a worthy and sacrificing character.

I. G. MATTHEWS.

CHRISTIANITY AND SOCIAL PROCESS. Shailer Mathews. New York: Harper and Brothers. 1935. Pp. 218. $2.00.

SHAILER MATHEWS has written numerous valuable books. This is one of his latest, and consists of seven lectures which he gave in India in the winter of 1933-34 on the foundation of the Barrows Lectures of the University of Chicago. Few men are so versatile and few have studied Christianity in its relation to social process as has Shailer Mathews.

The author holds that every religion is an aspect of social process and that every great civilization has produced a religion. Naturally he holds that it is impossible to separate religion from morality, since morals and religion are aspects of the same social process. The New Testament makes it plain that Christianity started as a social movement.

Christianity in the individual as well as Christianity and the morality of groups are considered, but the following topics which are of special interest just now are considered at greatest length: "Christianity and Economics"; "Christianity and Internationalism."

In a sense, the conclusion of the matter for Doctor Mathews is this: "Reforms have always been consolidated and inspired by the ferment of Christian ideals." In illustration, he indicates that "practically all the peace societies and foundations are representatives of religious interests."

Any book by Shailer Mathews would be able. This collection of addresses is timely also.

JAMES H. FRANKLIN.

CHRISTIAN REALITIES. Robert E. Speer. New York: Fleming H. Revell Company. 1935. Pp. 256. $2.50.

THIS book is really a series of addresses stenographically reported and their original character being largely retained, which helps to preserve the spirit of the author. Therefore those who know and love Robert E. Speer will find an additional enjoyment in reading the chapters of this book, written by a man of extraordinarily wide and rich Christian experience. The flow of his soul is felt in his lectures.

The volume begins with the question: "What is Christianity?" and affirms that first of all it is a body of historical facts. Next, it is a body of convictions. But it is more: there must be a light springing out of the facts and directed by an understanding of them.

"What Jesus Does for Us," is the subject of the second chapter, which is followed by fifteen others on subjects immediately recognized, for the most part, as both practical and vital. In the best sense, the volume is missionary also. Doctor Speer has written from his experience on what he considers the Christian realities, and it is to be hoped that his book will be widely read.

JAMES H. FRANKLIN.

TOWARD A CHRISTIAN AMERICA. Hermann N. Morse. New York: Council of Women for Home Missions, and Missionary Education Movement. 1935. Pp. viii, 207. Cloth, $1.00; paper, 60 cents.

DOCTOR MORSE, since ordination to the Presbyterian ministry in 1911, has given himself to the cause of home missions in one or another phase. Therefore, he is qualified to give an authoritative interpretation and evaluation of that phase of Kingdom work and progress.

The volume is composed of ten chapters which survey the home missions movement in varying phases, and these constitute a significant study. The reviewer's interest is arrested by Chapter IX, in particular, "Can Christians Cooperate?" This deals with one of the crucial problems of the day, namely the use of missionary funds to keep alive a competitive denominationalism on home mission fields. The author is cautious and juridical in his approach, but manifestly rejoices in the increasing areas of comity and cooperation. Perhaps he is overcautious; for has not the day arrived when our church leaders should begin to frankly advocate no further use of such monies to perpetuate our divisive, unchristian denominationalism?

WILLIAM R. MCNUTT.

ALL IN THE NAME OF GOD. Everett R. Clinchy. New York: The John Day Company. 1934. Pp. 194. $2.00.

THE title of this book is a very appropriate one for the nature of its contents. Recognizing the inconsistencies that exist between what men profess to believe, and how they actually meet life situations, the author strikingly portrays the story of racial and religious prejudice in the United States. Any open-minded religious person who reads this volume will be humiliated by the picture of ungodly acts being done in the name of God. Every minister and every lay member of the Christian church should have access to this stimulating treatment of the social injustices which have been sanctioned by religious groups and individuals.

Herein is contained enough evidence to justify the prediction that unless the Protestant Christian church takes a more aggressive part in racial understanding,

and actively seeks to eliminate the prevailing attitude of intolerance towards Catholics, Jews and other religious sects, it must ultimately face a time of serious reckoning. When this comes there is bound to be grave consequences. If enough people could be prevailed upon to read this book, racial and religious prejudice would be reduced to a minimum.

JOSEPH J. HANSON.

THE TWO SOURCES OF MORALITY AND RELIGION. Henry Bergson. Translated by R. Ashley Audra and Cloudesley Brereton, with the assistance of W. Horsfall Carter. New York: Henry Holt and Company. 1935. Pp. viii, 308. $3.00.

THE CROZER QUARTERLY for July, 1934, published a careful review of the original French edition of Mr. Bergson's work by Dr. Eugene M. Austin. It is a pleasure to be able to announce that Messrs. Henry Holt and Company have published this excellent English translation. We have long waited Bergson's pronouncement on religion. Ever since the publication of *Creative Evolution,* there has been speculation as to what Bergson would say about religion, if he said anything. In the present volume the author recognizes that he has gone beyond conclusions reached in the earlier work. Then he tried to keep close to facts that could be biologically confirmed. Now he recognizes that dynamic religion carries us into the field of probabilities. Philosophic certainty is a matter of degree, and calls for intuition as well as reason.

Dynamic religion is identified with mysticism, and mysticism is very carefully examined. That is not real mysticism for Bergson which does not issue in action. He believes in "the existence of a creative energy which is love, and which desires to produce from itself beings worthy to be loved." The nature of God is thus linked with the existence of God. "God is love, and the object of love." This is the quintessence of the mystic's faith. It is quite obvious that Bergson's treatment of religion is that of the philosopher rather than the historian. As a philosopher he offers a challenging interpretation, and in so doing rules out certain phenomena that the historian would wish to take into account. In a sense Bergson recognizes mysticism that does not come up to his standard, but only to reject it as not the genuine phenomenon. His analysis of religion into the static and dynamic is full of suggestiveness for even wider application.

The Two Sources of Morality and Religion is a permanent contribution to the philosophy of morals and religion, one with which future interpreters will have to reckon. It carries into the spheres of religion and morality that creative impetus on which the author has justly laid stress in other realms of thought.

A. STEWART WOODBURNE.

FINDING OURSELVES. Charles R. Brown. 1935. Pp. 144.

THE REFINER'S FIRE. J. W. G. Ward, First Presbyterian Church, Oak Park, Illinois. 1934. Pp. 124.

WHEN GOD HIDES. Paul E. Scherer, Evangelical Lutheran Church of the Holy Trinity, New York. 1934. Pp. vii, 90.

ARROWS OF LIGHT. Boynton Merrill, Second Church in Newton, West Newton, Massachusetts. 1935. Pp. x, 111.

THE INEXHAUSTIBLE CHRIST. Carl Hopkins Elmore, First Presbyterian Church, Englewood, New Jersey. 1935. Pp. vii, 130.

A Man of Property. Harris Elliott Kirk, Franklin Street Church, Baltimore, Maryland. 1935. Pp. 109.

The Way of Faith. Joseph R. Sizoo, New York Avenue Presbyterian Church, Washington. 1935. Pp. 107.

Life at Its Best. Avery Albert Shaw, President Northern Baptist Convention. 1935. Pp. 109.

New York: Harper and Brothers. $1.00 each.

These new volumes, the twenty-seventh to thirty-fourth published by Harper and Brothers in this series, make us acquainted with eight of the leading preaching geniuses of the American pulpit. The messages came from many denominations and from widely diversified pulpits. They are full of living truth and are interesting chronicles of ways and means in the search after God.

George F. Finnie.

The Blessing of Believing. Strother A. Campbell. New York: Fleming H. Revell Company. 1935. Pp. 121. $1.00.

Doctor Campbell, son of Crozer and pastor of the great Baptist Temple, Charleston, West Virginia, gives us here a volume of refreshing sermons. He dedicates it to his people whose love and loyalty have inspired these messages. The introduction is written by Harold Cooke Phillips, of Cleveland. About the sermons he says, ". . . They come from one who possesses real religious insight and about whose thinking there is a timely timelessness." We may add to that commendation that these sermons reveal the author to be a preacher who is, in the finest sense, prophetic. He combines in his messages the old and the new with skill and courage.

William R. McNutt.

The Church, Catholic and Protestant. William Adams Brown. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons. 1935. Pp. xix, 421. $2.75.

The world in this day is in tragic need of that which only vital, living religion can give. Hope lies in Christianity alone. But in the day of this great need the forces of organized Christianity are weakened and are made unnecessarily impotent. Is there a cure for this sad state? This is the issue which is raised by Doctor Brown and to its thorough discussion he dedicates this praiseworthy volume.

Catholicism and Protestantism are both studied historically and evaluationally with a view to discovering how great are those treasures held in common and which could make for a working unity between these two major groups of Christians. Doctor Brown writes out of so fair and historic perspective and in such irenic spirit that he should be read with much profit by both Catholic and Protestant.

Part I. "The Church and the Churches" discusses what is the common denominator of the two bodies, wherein they differ, what is the changing and what is the permanent. Part II. "Catholic Christianity" appreciatively evaluates Catholic religion. Part III. "Contemporary Protestantism" appreciatively evaluates Protestant religion. Part IV. "The Church, Catholic and Protestant," sets forth the need of a united Christianity, what each group may learn from the other, and how differences may be hopefully dealt with.

It is altogether a notable piece of work, a Religious Book Club selection, and to be highly commended to thoughtful readers.

William R. McNutt.

JUDAISM, AN ANALYSIS AND AN INTERPRETATION. Israel Robert Levinthal, L. H. D. Rabbi, the Brooklyn Jewish Center. New York: Funk and Wagnalls Company. 1935. Pp. xii, 272. $2.50.

THIS is an interesting interpretation of Judaism. There is a fine emphasis on those principles that seem most essential to religion. In all the discussion ethics is made central to Jewish life, while ritual and ceremony are presented as the symbol of that inner life and at the same time they are considered the fence that constitutes an essential guard to that life. It is possible that the author makes too much of the uniqueness of Judaism and the essential place that the Holy Land occupies in the religion and life of the people, but the book is a good interpretation of the values and the claims of Judaism.

I. G. MATTHEWS.

BOOK NOTICES

PEACE YEAR BOOK 1935. London: National Peace Council. In America, distributed by World Peace Foundation, 40 Mount Vernon Street, Boston, Mass. Pp. 312. 60 cents.

THIS is a most valuable book of reference for peace-workers the world over. The first part contains admirable reviews of the progress of peace in 1934, the work of the League of Nations, the discussions regarding Disarmament, the Saar problem, etc. In the second and third parts we have directories of peace and kindred organizations in all parts of the world. Over seventy organizations are given for this country alone. In the fourth part there are included statistics of the armies, navies, air forces, armament budgets, and traffic in munitions for the leading nations.

EAST AND WEST. An International Series of Open Letters, Number 4. Gilbert Murray and Rabindranath Tagore. New York: World Peace Foundation, 8 West Fortieth Street, 1935. Pp. 65. 75 cents.

IN these letters the two world figures, Professor Gilbert Murray and Doctor Rabindranath Tagore, discuss the necessity for a greater measure of international and intellectual cooperation. Both believe that there is a larger degree of appreciation of the folly and stupidity of competition and the use of brute force, and of the need for cooperation than ever before. At the same time the opposing forces are unprecedentedly obstinate. Both writers are optimistic as to the future. Needless to say these letters are literary gems, as well as mirrors of idealism.

INTO ALL THE WORLD. Arthur J. Brown and John D. Freeman. Nashville: The Sunday School Board of the Southern Baptist Convention. 1935. Pp. 106. Cloth, 60 cents; paper, 40 cents.

THIS little volume is an adaptation of Doctor Brown's work *The Why and How of Foreign Missions* with the design of using it for a mission study-book. The work of amendation is that of Doctor Freeman, Executive Secretary of the Tennessee Baptist Convention.

THE BAPTIST FAITH. E. Y. Mullins and H. W. Tribble. Nashville: The Sunday School Board of the Southern Baptist Convention. 1935. Pp. 124. Cloth, 60 cents; paper, 40 cents.

THIS handbook is a condensation and adaptation of the late President Mullins' well known work *The Axioms of Religion.* It is the work of Professor Tribble, his successor in the chair of theology at Louisville. As it is designed for lay workers, the work has been revamped with their needs in view.

LOOKING TOWARD A PUBLIC WELFARE PLAN. A Digest of Recent Opinion in the Fields of Social Work and Public Welfare Administration. Compiled by Russell H. Kurtz. New York: Russell Sage Foundation. Pp. 34. 1935.

WHETHER public welfare, which has become a major industry in recent years under the guise of social work, is to be subject to "emergency" measures only or to become an abiding function of government, concerns our large army of welfare workers. If the latter policy is pursued, then far-reaching legal and administrative changes must be brought about in federal, state and municipal centers in order to make welfare activities effective and sound.

YEAR BOOK OF AMERICAN CHURCHES. Edited by Herman C. Weber. The Association Press. 1935. Pp. viii, 209. $2.00

THIS is a record of religious activities in the United States for the years of 1933-1934, issued under the auspices of the Department of Research and Education of the Federal Council of the Churches of Christ in America. It is a valuable work of reference.

POOR RELIEF ADMINISTRATION IN PENNSYLVANIA. Alice F. Liveright. Harrisburg: State Department of Welfare. Pp. 303. 1934.

THIS study of "Poor Relief" was made by the Department of Welfare with the assistance of federal funds from the Civil Works Administration. Thoroughly documented, the survey reveals what burdensome responsibilities rest upon poor directors due to the increase of unemployment and hard times, and how handicapped these directors are in the carrying out of their duties owing to the incredible confusion in the statute laws of the Commonwealth relating to poor relief.

BIBLIOGRAPHY OF THE CONTINENTAL REFORMATION: Materials Available in English. Roland H. Bainton. Chicago: The American Society of Church History. 1935. Pp. 54. $1.00.

STUDENTS of Church History and especially those of the Reformation are under a debt to Professor Bainton for this exceptionally well prepared list of bibliography. Materials are divided into sections according to special phases of the Reformation such as sources translated, general histories, the related social questions of politics, economics and education. Larger divisions are according to the national forms of the Reformation and the leaders within each, which includes the numerous biographies which have appeared.

The abbreviations of the journals in which articles have been published makes readily possible acquaintance with these contributions as well as with those of a more extended research. It is difficult to imagine a more complete list of this particular bibliography or one more conveniently arranged.

FOUNDATIONS OF HAPPINESS IN MARRIAGE. Leland Foster Wood. Providence: Roger Williams Press. 1934. Pp. 93. $1.00.

BEATITUDES FOR THE FAMILY. Leland Foster Wood. Providence: Roger Williams Press. 1934. Pp. 106. $1.00.

THE secretary of the Committee on Marriage and the Home of the Federal Council of the Churches of Christ in America has provided the church with two timely brochures on family relations. The first mentioned would make an admirable gift for the clergyman to present to a couple for premarital reading and the second likewise at the time of marriage for home-making purposes. The "beatitudes" are presented in proverbial style and with a strong religious stress.

SOCIAL SETTLEMENTS IN NEW YORK CITY: Their Activities, Policies, and Administration. Albert J. Kennedy, Kathryn Farra and Associates. Published for the Welfare Council of New York City by Columbia University Press: New York City. 1935. Pp. xi, 599. $6.00.

THIS thoroughly documented unit of research presents "an inventory of the services rendered by the body of settlements in the City (New York City), an appraisal of the quality of work done by the houses, and an examination of their general administrative organization."

BOOKS RECEIVED

THE BEGINNINGS OF THE EPISCOPAL CHURCH IN CONNECTICUT. Origen Storrs Seymour. New Haven, Conn.: Yale University Press. 1934. Pp. 32. 25 cents.

THE FOREIGN MISSIONARY ENTERPRISE AND ITS SINCERE CRITICS. Cleland B. McAfee. New York: Fleming H. Revell Company. 1935. Pp. 190. $1.50.

THE MYSTICAL LIFE. Roger Bastide. New York: Harper and Brothers. 1935. Pp. 256. $2.50.

PEACE AND THE PLAIN MAN. Norman Angell. New York: Harper and Brothers. 1935. Pp. xi, 334. $2.50.

SACRED SITES AND WAYS. Gustaf Dalman. Translated by Paul P. Levertoff. New York: The Macmillan Company. 1935. Pp. xii, 398. $3.50.

WHAT DID JESUS THINK? Stanley Brown-Serman and Harold Adye Prichard. New York: The Macmillan Company. 1935. Pp. xi, 287. $2.50.

CHRIST'S ALTERNATIVE TO COMMUNISM. E. Stanley Jones. New York: The Abingdon Press. 1935. Pp. 302. $2.00.

THE GODS IN PLAIN GARB. A Study in Psychology. Emil Humble. New York: G. P. Putnam's Sons. 1935. Pp. 314. $3.00.

THE MEANING OF SHINTO. J. W. T. Mason. New York: E. P. Dutton and Company. 1935. Pp. 252. $2.50.

LIVING WITH BOOKS. Helen E. Haines. New York: Columbia University Press. 1935. Pp. xiv, 505. $4.00.

REVEREND JOHN DOE, D. D. Edwin McNeill Poteat, Jr. New York: Harper and Brothers. 1935. Pp. 127. $1.25.

EDUCATION FOR AN AGE OF POWER. Joseph K. Hart. New York: Harper and Brothers. 1935. Pp. ix, 245. $2.50.

FINDING THE WAY. Robert Harris Gearhart, Jr. New York: The Association Press. 1935. Pp. 141. $1.00.

MODERN MYSTICS. Sir Francis Younghusband. New York: E. P. Dutton and Company. 1935. Pp. viii, 316. $3.00.

SOCIAL CHANGES DURING DEPRESSION AND RECOVERY. Edited by William F. Ogburn. Chicago: University of Chicago Press. Reprint from the American Journal of Sociology. 1935. Pp. 711-828. $1.00.

PHILOSOPHY OF RELIGION. Proceedings of the Tenth Annual Meeting of the American Catholic Philosophical Association. Washington, D. C.: The Catholic University of America. 1935. Pp. v, 183. $1.50.

DEEP DARK RIVER. Robert Rylee. New York: Farrar and Rinehart, Inc. 1935. Pp. 308. $2.50.

CREATIVE CHRISTIANITY. Shailer Mathews. Nashville, Tenn.: Cokesbury Press. 1935. Pp. 167. $1.50.

AMERICAN COMMENTARY ON THE OLD TESTAMENT. Minor Prophets. Vol. 2. William J. McGlothlin. John B. Gough Pidge. I. G. Matthews. Mitchell Bronk. Philadelphia: The Judson Press. 1935. Pp. 20, 46, 56, 34. $2.00.

THE CHRISTIANITY OF IGNATIUS OF ANTIOCH. Cyril Charles Richardson. New York: Columbia University Press. 1935. Pp. xi, 120. $2.00.

THE EARLY PHILOSOPHERS OF GREECE. Matthew Thompson McClure. New York: D. Appleton-Century Company. 1935. Pp. ix, 218. $2.25.

SOCIAL SALVATION. John C. Bennett. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons. 1935. Pp. xv, 222. $2.00.

CHAOS IN MEXICO. Charles S. McFarland. New York: Harper and Brothers. 1935. Pp. 284. $2.00.

THE CHURCH, COMMUNITY AND STATE. J. H. Oldham. London, England: Student Christian Movement. 1935. Pp. 48. 1s.